Summer 2001

A Description of New Teacher Induction Programs in the State of Georgia

Judi Harris Wilson

A DESCRIPTION OF NEW TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Judi Harris Wilson

A DESCRIPTION OF NEW TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

A Dissertation

Presented to

the College of Graduate Studies of

Georgia Southern University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Administration

---

by

Judi Harris Wilson

August 2001

June 19, 2001

To the Graduate School:

This dissertation entitled "A Description of New Teacher Induction Programs in the State of Georgia" and written by Judi Harris Wilson is presented to the College of Graduate Studies of Georgia Southern University. I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Educational Administration.

Supervising Committee Chair

We have reviewed this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Department Chair

Accepted for the Averitt College of Graduate Studies:

G. Lane Van Tassell
Dean, Averitt College of Graduate Studies

DEDICATION

First and foremost, this dissertation is dedicated to my Lord who provided me with the strength, patience, love, encouragement, and guidance needed to complete this task. I owe the honor, glory, and praise to Him for making this venture possible and successful!

This dissertation is dedicated in honor of my parents, Dr. Charles and Nell Doris Harris, who helped me never to forget my dream that began at age 10 of "getting my doctorate just like my daddy." Thank you for instilling in me the value of knowledge and giving me the confidence and tools to succeed in making this goal a reality. I will always be grateful for your unconditional love, positive influence, and the financial sacrifices you made throughout my educational journey.

This dissertation is also dedicated to my family for their unending encouragement:

To my wonderful husband and best friend, Greg, who constantly demonstrated his caring, understanding, helpfulness, sacrifices, support, and most of all his unconditional love throughout this endeavor. He is an incredible blessing from God, one I pray I will never take for granted. I am looking forward to spending the rest of our lives together!

To my precious twin boys, Carter and Tanner, who gave me extra hugs and smiles when I desperately needed them and who enabled me to keep things in their proper perspective. Although I am proud of my degree attainment, they are my most treasured accomplishments.

"Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind and with all your strength." Mark 12:30

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with sincere and deep appreciation that I acknowledge and thank the following individuals for the invaluable parts they played in the completion of my dissertation:

Dr. Mike Richardson, my committee chairman, whose wise counsel and expectations for excellence promoted my professional growth. He made the journey so enjoyable and rewarding! I will always be grateful to Dr. Chan for his prompt responses and patience in leading me through the quantitative analysis. I sincerely appreciate the expert assistance of Dr. Jording and Dr. Page and their willingness to serve as members of my dissertation committee. The individual and collective assistance of my committee throughout this study was indispensable to me.

I am grateful to all the participating new teachers in the state of Georgia whose cooperation made this study possible. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to complete and return my survey!

A heartfelt thank you goes out to Shelby Talley who allowed me to use her instrument in my study. She was so helpful, kind, and a special source of encouragement during the dissertation process. I need to thank Shelby especially for her prayers!

A special note of appreciation to all of my family, friends, and colleagues who encouraged the new teachers in their school districts to return the surveys! A special thank you is owed to Dr. Tom Davis, Mary Harris, Lynne Hise, Lisa Jones, Myra Kinney, and Stacey Street for their help.

Thank you to my very special sister, Suzanne Blair, for her genuine belief that I could reach my goal and her willingness to love my boys when I was busy meeting deadlines.

I deeply appreciate the efforts of Kelley Mahoney, who was always willing to proofread and edit the manuscript whenever asked. I hope to do the same for her one day soon!

To Michelle Wiley, a precious friend, who helped me through the "crunch times" by typing, stuffing envelopes in the middle of the night, calling with words of encouragement, and caring for my boys as though they were her own. I am grateful to Jason Wiley for sharing his wife with me during the past two years! Thank you to Andrea Highsmith and Stephanie Seawell for also helping with my boys during stressful days and to Marcy Billings for helping me prepare the first mailing!

A very special thank you to my special cohort members Amy Wright, Charlotte Pipkin, and Hightower, who wouldn't even let me consider being ABD! Their encouragement was never ending!

I am grateful to Dr. Doris Blazer, my major professor at Furman University for nurturing the seed my parents had planted regarding my pursuit of this degree and to Flora Bryant, Dr. L.C. (Buster) Evans, and Kathy Peavy for encouraging me to "go for it!"

To my grandparents, Rev. and Mrs. J. T. Tyson, who began pursuing their college degrees while parenting four young children and working full-time, I will always be grateful for your incredible example! May your commitment be repeated in our family for generations.

To all my extended family, friends, Bible Study Fellowship (BSF) prayer warriors, and my church family at Warren Baptist Church, thank you for your prayers and your constant words of love and support. The prayers lifted up on my behalf were felt and realized. God has truly used this experience to "sharpen me like iron." It is my prayer that this degree will be used to benefit the Kingdom!

VITA

Judi Harris Wilson

Judi Harris Wilson received her Baccalaureate degree in Early Childhood and Elementary Education from Furman University in 1990. She completed her Masters degree in Early Childhood Education at the University of Georgia in 1993. Judi earned her Specialist degree in Educational Leadership from the University of Georgia in 1995. She completed her Doctorate in Educational Administration from Georgia Southern University in August 2001.

She is currently certified in Leadership and Administration and Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education (Certified to teach PK-8). She has taught elementary school in Athens, Perry, and Cochran, Georgia. She has also served as an administrator in the middle and primary grades and as a system-level Title I/REP Coordinator. She has authored numerous grants and served as the coordinator of the New Teacher Induction Program in Bleckley County, which served as the impetus for this dissertation. The mother of twin boys, Tanner and Carter, Dr. Wilson currently resides in Augusta, Georgia. In her spare time, she enjoys going to church, traveling, reading, and spending time with her family.

ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTION OF NEW TEACHER

INDUCTION PROGRAMS IN

THE STATE OF GEORGIA

AUGUST 2001

JUDI HARRIS WILSON

B.A., FURMAN UNIVERSITY

M.Ed., THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Ed.S., THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Ed.D., GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Directed by: Dr. Michael D. Richardson

The purpose of this study was to descriptively analyze new teacher induction programs across the state of Georgia regarding the support programs school districts provided for new teachers. Subjects for this study were 500 randomly selected Georgia teachers who completed their first year of teaching during the 1999-2000 school year. Participation in this study required that the subjects complete and return a survey developed in 1990 by Dr. Shelby Talley and modified by the researcher for this study. There were 327 surveys returned with a collective response rate of 65.4%.

This study found that induction practices to socialize new teachers in Georgia wer weak in the areas of providing building tours, introducing the novices to building personnel, securing housing and providing information about the community. Most teachers were assigned mentors, but many were described by survey participants as

ineffective, unavailable, and as teaching in a different grade level. Data regarding assignment factors revealed that most teachers were assigned to teaching positions reflective of their training and education and were assigned to a classroom rather than "floating" between classrooms. However, this study's results verified that special considerations are not common in the state of Georgia regarding the types of students assigned to new teachers, reduction in workloads, or reduction in class sizes.

Regarding the professional needs of teachers, most new teachers were provided adequate information about the evaluation process, appropriate feedback regarding their performance, and school norms were clearly communicated. However, the majority of new teachers were not provided with curricula in a timely manner, new teacher handbooks, or opportunities to observe others and to be observed.

The majority of new teachers surveyed in the state of Georgia, 41.3%, recommended continuing the induction program in their school districts with minor modifications. There were 19% of the participants who recommended major modifications to the program, and 7% recommended replacing the existing program completely. There were 443 qualitative responses received from participants identifying concerns, needs, and suggestions for future program improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents (continued) Page

Table of Contents (continued) Page

Table of Contents (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

Education is the biggest political issue in this country, and one major educational concern of the new millennium is the number of teachers retiring in this decade. In fact, the nation will need over 2 million additional teachers during the next 10 years (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Yasin, 1999; Southworth, 2000). This statistic, coupled with the fact that approximately 20% of new teachers leave the profession in the first 3 years, and 9.3% quit before finishing their first year (Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 1999) is a serious concern for Americans. Schools located in urban districts often reflect even higher teacher attrition rates (Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 1999) thus requiring even more new teachers in the very areas where experience is a necessity. The high rate of teacher turnover, compounded by rising student enrollments and the aging teaching force, suggests that American students will be spending more time in the future with new teachers (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Kestner, 1994).

Induction programs have been developed in school districts across the nation to assist new teachers in progressing smoothly into their new careers (Ashburn, 1987; Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996, Southworth, 2000). These programs were developed partially because of the statistics regarding the high attrition rates of new teachers and the concerns arising from the aging teaching force in America. Other factors contributing to the rising interest in these programs may be attributed to the emphasis on improving the teaching performance of first year teachers, the need to eliminate teachers who do not possess the skills necessary for effective teaching, and the need to advance the mandatory guidelines and conditions related to induction and certification (Huling-Austin, 1986).

New teacher induction programs are defined as formal, planned experiences and activities designed and implemented by school districts to facilitate new teachers'

transitions from student teacher to competent classroom teacher. These programs include but are not limited to orientation seminars, observations with follow-up conferences, opportunities to observe other teachers, assignment of a mentor, release time or reduced teaching load, scheduled support meetings, and training sessions on curriculum, effective instructional practices, classroom management, and discipline (Huling-Austin,1986).

Many of these programs are structured, data-driven, and responsive to the unique needs of new teachers. These programs prove that induction into the teaching force does work. Unfortunately, many other types of programs may be less helpful in assisting new teachers into their new profession (Halford, 1998; Ryan, Newman, Mager, Applegate, Lesley, Flora, & Johnston, 1980); thus, teachers may be lost if these programs are not strengthened. Steps must be taken to insure that all teacher induction programs adequately support new teachers to decrease teacher attrition rates and to advocate strong instructional teaching strategies.

New teachers face a multitude of challenges as they enter the teaching profession. Often, new teachers report feeling inadequately prepared to cope with classroom realities such as physical and emotional isolation, intense workloads, parental and administrative pressures, and classroom management concerns (Darling-Hammond, 1999). Induction programs can assist new teachers with these struggles. Historically, induction practices have played a key role in the new teacher's decision to continue in this chosen profession or in his or her decision to leave (Mark & Anderson, 1985; Morey, 1990; Schlechty & Vance, 1983).

The problems new teachers face are not insurmountable. Steps can be taken to insure the success of new teachers and to ease their transition into this challenging but rewarding profession (Chase, 1998). This study was intended to provide critical information to Georgia's educational administrators regarding the effectiveness of existing induction practices and identify concerns of new teachers. It is essential for school administrators to have accurate and timely data before making decisions regarding

programming or support programs designed to assist new teachers. This study was designed to evaluate the transition of new teachers into the profession by analyzing the perceptions of new teachers toward new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia.

Statement of the Problem

Partially in response to the high attrition rates of new teachers, legislators and administrators in school districts across the nation have implemented formal induction programs designed to assist new teachers in making a smooth and effective transition into the teaching profession. Formal induction programs were recognized as effective methods for helping teachers adjust to their new roles. These programs were also methods for improving the teaching techniques of new teachers and contributing to the retention of new teachers.

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia. Specifically, the researcher explored what induction assistance was provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia, as well as the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers. The research was used to establish if the induction assistance provided is adequate to meet the needs of new teachers in the state of Georgia. One facet of the study identified the needs for assistance as perceived by Georgia's new teachers. Another area investigated the assistance provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia in the areas of socialization into the school environment and culture, special consideration in assignments, and professional needs. Another feature explored the adequacy of existing induction programs as perceived by Georgia's new teachers.

The researcher also investigated the relationship existing between the needs of teachers and college-degree level, institution from which the participant graduated, and level of teaching position. Finally, the teachers were invited to make recommendations for modifying or improving the induction program in Georgia.

Research Questions

The overarching research question to be answered by this study was the following: What were the perceptions of new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia? Based on this major research question, subquestions were developed:

1. What were the needs of assistance as perceived by new teachers in the state of Georgia?
2. What assistance was provided to new teachers in school districts across the state of Georgia to induct new teachers in the following areas: (a) socialization into the school environment and culture, (b) special consideration in assignments, and (c) professional needs?
3. What were the perceptions of new teachers about the adequacy of existing induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia?
4. What differences, if any, existed in the needs of the teachers among the categories of the following variables: (a) college-degree level, (b) institution from which the participant graduated, and (c) grade level of teaching position?
5. What recommendations, if any, did new teachers have for modifying or improving the induction program in the state of Georgia?

The Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the new teacher induction programs across the state of Georgia to descriptively analyze school districts with regard to the support programs they provide for new teachers. While there have been landmark studies of new teacher induction programs generated in states such as California, New Jersey, North Carolina, Connecticut, Kansas, Kentucky, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas, the researcher's intensive review of the literature revealed an absence of current research in the state of Georgia.

Specifically, a review of the literature revealed a significant lack of information regarding the induction practices presently occurring throughout the state of Georgia and the perceptions of new teachers' needs of assistance. Talley conducted a descriptive study devoted to these issues in 1990, but to this date, another study has not been located describing current programs in the state of Georgia. The findings of Dr. Talley's study indicated that insufficient assistance was provided to Georgia's new teachers, and the assistance that was provided was not perceived to be adequate. Talley's research also indicated that Georgia's teachers had strong instructional needs which were not being met. Thus, it was imperative that another study be completed to compare her findings to current conditions among new teachers in the state.

Additionally, the Georgia Department of Education and local school districts across the state have implemented new induction programs and have provided funds for mentoring since Talley's study was completed. The effect of these changes has not been formally investigated, indicating the need for this study. Therefore, the proposed study should contribute to the knowledge in the field of new teacher induction and help school leaders make data-driven decisions regarding program development in the future.

Additionally, it is critical that the state of Georgia evaluate each school district's efforts to support new teachers. Statistical information points to the urgency of such a study. The present high attrition rate of new teachers affects students and the quality of the educational program in the state. Research regarding the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of existing programs could assist state administrators in recognizing and utilizing program strengths and remediating any weaknesses identified in this study.

Empirical data indicates that educational leaders must become aware of the research addressing how to assist these new teachers in order to provide a strong support system to ease their successful transition into their new career. Therefore, this study should both contribute to the knowledge in this field and assist in the educational decision-making process. Additionally, these findings may assist Georgia educators and

legislators as they plan for instructional programs to support new teachers. The findings of this study will be shared with the Georgia Department of Education, the Georgia Leadership Academy, and Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs) for use in the Georgia Mentor Teacher Program. Moreover, the data which emerge may provide information to justify or to re-evaluate the continuation of funding for programs across the state. Also, school system staff development coordinators and other school administrators could use the research results for continuous program improvement within their respective school districts.

Other audiences for this study include colleges of education and national and state professional organizations. Professors of education need this research to narrow the discrepancy between what they are currently teaching pre-service teachers and what new teachers identify as necessary components of training programs. Professors who teach educational leadership courses could use this research to assist aspiring and current administrators in recognizing the characteristics of effective teacher induction programs and their critical role as administrators in supporting new teachers. National and state professional organizations could utilize this research in evaluating and strengthening existing and future support systems for new teachers.

Through employment in three different Georgia school districts (Clarke, Houston, and Bleckley Counties), the researcher had the unique opportunity to be involved in three new teacher induction programs as a participant and most recently as a coordinator. Based on personal experiences in these three programs, the researcher has observed that a number of discrepancies exist in the implementation of the new teacher induction programs offered. It was believed that the quality of offerings to new teachers depended largely on the leadership in different school districts. Concerned about these possible inequities, the researcher felt compelled to investigate the situation across the state of Georgia to compare and contrast program components. This study should enable the

researcher to determine the extent to which induction programs across the state are meeting the needs of new teachers.

Procedures

Subjects for this study were new teachers in Georgia who completed their first year of teaching during the 1999-2000 school year. From Georgia's population of 2,226 full-time new teachers, 500 were identified by random selection. Participation in this study required that the subjects complete and return a data-collection survey. This survey was utilized to identify components of induction programs across the state and the perceptions of new teachers regarding their needs of assistance in these programs. In addition, the survey offered a qualitative feature enabling respondents to identify additional program features they perceive as strengthening future induction programs.

Items included in the survey were based upon current practices in new teacher induction programs across the United States and common components of effective programs identified in the literature. The instrument used in the study was a multiple-response questionnaire developed by Shelby Talley in 1990 during her doctoral studies at The University of Alabama (Talley, 1991). Validity was established by a panel of experts prior to the administration of the original survey by Talley in 1990. Pilot testing of the instrument also occurred in 1990, and the researcher made changes based upon the findings.

Reliability testing occurred in the spring of 1990, but Talley did not include the split-half reliability test results in her dissertation and was unable to locate the documentation to support the test (per phone conversation in January, 2001). The researcher assumed the instrument was acceptable and used the data generated from the current study to test the instrument again. Therefore, the researcher completed reliability testing utilizing Cronbach's alpha simultaneously with data analysis in the spring of 2001. Cronbach's alpha is a widely used statistical technique for computing test score reliability (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Reliability coefficients range from 0.00 (no reliability) to 1.00

(perfect reliability). Generally, an acceptable rate of reliability among researchers is considered to be .80 or higher (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

The researcher made only minor modifications of Talley's original instrument, and the revised survey was mailed to new teachers in March 2001. Descriptive statistics were utilized to summarize the data from this study and to describe the patterns of responses. Data were compiled by measures of central tendency (means, standard deviations, and modes) and measures of variability (standard deviation, variance, and range) using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if significant differences existed among the categories of the variables of college-degree level, institution from which the participant graduated, and grade level of teaching position. Responses from survey participants were compared to Talley's results in 1991. Comparisons and contrasts were made, and the researcher analyzed changes that have occurred in the induction program in the state of Georgia over the past 10 years. Additionally, participants were invited to make recommendations and suggestions regarding future induction program improvement in his or her school district.

Assumptions

In this study, one assumption was made. It was assumed that the new teachers selected for this study would be accurate and honest in describing their district's program components and their perceptions of the need of each of those components.

Delimitations

This study was restricted by the following delimitations: first, this study only evaluated the induction assistance provided to new teachers and the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers in the state of Georgia, and the findings may not be generalizable to other geographic areas. Second, the results represented new teachers' perceptions reflecting their experience during the 1999-2000 school year and no subsequent years.

Limitations

This study was restricted by the following limitations: first, this study was limited to those responding to the survey. While every effort was made to maximize respondent reply, any responses not received have the potential to bias the results of the study. Secondly, this study was limited to teachers who were employed as teachers in the state of Georgia during the 2000-2001 school year. It did not include teachers who left the teaching field after his or her first year of teaching during the 1999-2000 school year.

Definitions of Key Terms

1. New teachers: Teachers with no previous paid teaching experience (not including teachers with previous paid teaching experience but new to the district).
2. New teacher induction programs: Formal, planned experiences and activities designed and implemented by school districts to facilitate new teachers' transitions from student teacher to competent classroom teacher. The purpose of these programs is to increase the new teacher's knowledge, to improve teaching effectiveness, and to increase the retention of larger numbers of highly qualified teachers.
3. Formal induction practices: New teacher induction program activities include the strategies, resources, and evaluation criteria needed to implement programs for new teachers.
4. Induction program activities: Induction programs which include, but are not limited to: orientation seminars, observations with follow-up conferences, assignments of mentors, opportunities to observe other teachers, scheduled support meetings, and training sessions on curriculum, effective instructional strategies, assessment, classroom management, and discipline. Additionally, programs may provide the new teacher with printed information outlining district and school policies and procedures, and release time or a reduced teaching load.

5. Mentoring: A nurturing process in which a more skilled or experienced teacher serves as a role model to a new teacher by teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counseling, supporting, and befriending a less skilled or inexperienced teacher for the purpose of promoting the new teacher's professional and/or personal development. The mentor is regarded as an excellent role model and should demonstrate exemplary teaching practices and techniques.
6. Mentor: A teacher who is more skilled or has more experience in the teaching profession who serves as a role model to a new teacher.
7. Protégé: The new teacher who is paired with a more skilled or more experienced teacher for the purpose of promoting his or her professional and personal development.
8. Characteristics of an effective teacher: An effective teacher who demonstrates high expectations for student success, is a strong classroom manager, and develops and implements lessons ensuring student mastery.
9. Perceptions: The beliefs of the new teacher.
10. Induct: To assist the new teacher in making a successful transition into his or her teaching career.
11. Participants: First-year teachers participating in a formal new teacher induction program.
12. School-level administrator: The individual who has the direct responsibility of hiring, supervising, retention, suspension, and termination of teachers. This person has the responsibility of overseeing the competence of new teachers and of providing the necessary support systems to ensure their success in the classroom.
13. Career ladder: The opportunities a teacher has to advance in his or her profession financially and professionally.

Summary

In response to the high attrition rates of new teachers, formal teacher induction programs have emerged to assist these teachers in making a smooth and effective transition into their careers. The researcher's review of literature revealed a significant lack of information regarding the induction practices presently occurring throughout the state of Georgia and concerning the identification of the perceptions of new teachers' needs of assistance. It is of paramount importance for educational administrators to have data representing what new teachers reveal that they need. Some research has been done in this area by Shelby Talley who conducted a descriptive study devoted to these issues in 1990. However, to this date another study has not been located describing current programs in the state of Georgia. Therefore, this study was designed to evaluate the transition of new teachers into the profession by analyzing the current assistance provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia and the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers.

This study utilized a survey instrument which was administered by mail to 500 randomly selected new teachers in the state of Georgia during the 2000-2001 school year. The survey reflected their experiences as a new teacher during the previous year (1999-2000). The results of the study should contribute to the knowledge in the field of teacher induction and assist school leaders in making data-driven decisions regarding program development in the future.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In the past two decades, statistics have been published regarding the high numbers of new teachers leaving the profession each year. Many cite monetary concerns as a reason for leaving, but a number leave because of poor working conditions and a lack of support. These statistics support the concern for new teachers' work conditions and reinforce the importance of the careful placement of new teachers during their induction years and of supporting these teachers with induction programs.

The difficulties faced by new teachers have a profound effect on the students in our society. If the teacher is frustrated, generally this frustration will spill over into the classroom. However, the problems new teachers face are not hopeless. Research indicates that effective support programs can be generated and implemented by school districts to assist new teachers as they progress through their careers.

Historically, induction practices have played a key role in the retention of new teachers. Likewise, new teachers express more satisfaction in their jobs if enrolled in a teacher induction program. Therefore, the significance and impact of new teacher induction programs cannot be overstated.

National High Attrition Rates of Teachers

In the 1980s, research indicated that 15% of new teachers left after their first year of teaching (Schlechty & Vance, 1983). These researchers further suggested that approximately 15% of new teachers left after their second year and that an additional 10% left the profession after their third year. Nationally, in the 1980s, 40% to 50% of all new teachers left during the first 7 years of their career (Mark & Anderson, 1985; Morey, 1990). Currently, it is estimated that 30-50% of all teachers leave the profession within

their first 3 to 5 years of teaching, while the problem is even worse in inner-city schools (Ballinger, 2000).

While the rate of teacher attrition is not quite as high today as it has been in the past three decades, it is still important to analyze attrition patterns and their implications for the nation's future need for teachers as the present teacher work force ages (Condition of Education, 1998). The latest data available indicate that 6% of full-time public school teachers and 10% of full-time private school teachers who taught during the 1993-94 school year left teaching before the 1994-95 school year (Schools and Staffing Survey, 1994-95, Indicator 59, Table 59-2). Of those full-time teachers who left teaching that year, approximately 20% of those teachers were younger than 25. Approximately 65% of those teachers who left teaching that year were over 59 years old (Schools and Staffing Survey, Indicator 59, Chart 2). This data indicated that the highest rates of attrition are among teachers 60 and older and those under 25. Data from this survey completed by the U.S. Department of Education also indicates that the number of full-time teachers who leave teaching has remained fairly consistent from 1987 to 1995 (Schools and Staffing Survey, Indicator 59, Chart 1).

Since there is little educators can do to minimize the aging workforce, it seems necessary to focus attention towards attracting and retaining teachers who are interested in teaching as a career. Amazingly, many of these early defectors from teaching are among the profession's most academically talented individuals (Ballinger, 2000; Mark & Anderson, 1980). These individuals left because of the high discrepancy between their expectations and the realities of the classroom. "Reality shock" has been used to describe the experiences of new teachers as their idealistic fantasies are bombarded with reality (McArthur, 1978). Veenman (1984) believed that the reality shock new teachers experience is "the assimilation of a complex reality which forces itself incessantly upon the beginning teacher, day in and day out" (p. 144).

As of 1999, the United States employed 3.1 million teachers (Yasin, 1999). That number was projected to increase by 1.1% annually to reach a total of 3.46 million by 2008. Some researchers predict that districts will have to employ 200,000 teachers annually over the next 10 years to keep pace with teacher retirements and rising student enrollments (Yasin). According to the Georgia Alliance for Public Education (1990), approximately 4,000 to 5,000 new teachers will need to be inducted into the teaching profession each year in Georgia if growth continues at the rate it has since 1986.

Educators and other citizens must realize that the difficulties experienced by new teachers have dire consequences for the children in our society. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation (1986) reported that "students are the primary victims when beginning teachers fail" (p. 7). Additionally, when new teachers are unsuccessful, the blame is shared by school districts, administrators, other teachers, teacher education institutions, and professional organizations. The teaching career is somewhat static, and the same expectations are made of a new teacher as are made of a veteran teacher (Chase, 1998; Huling-Austin, 1988; Lortie, 1975).

Camp and Heath (1988) indicated that student teaching experiences are not sufficiently preparing the teacher candidate for the realities and demands of full-time teaching. Within the first few years, too many teachers leave the profession due to feelings of abandonment, isolation, and frustration (Huling-Austin, 1990). These staggering statistics imply that many teachers were not adequately supported during the first few vulnerable years of their careers. Halford stated that she has heard education referred to as "the profession that eats its young" (1998, p. 33).

These issues are especially appalling since statisticians project that over 2 million new teachers will enter United States schools in the next decade (Darling-Hammond, 1999). Depending on the assumptions made, statisticians' projections for the number of newly hired public school teachers needed by 2008-09 ranges from 1.7 million to 2.7 million (Hussar, 1999). In 1996, the National Commission on Teaching and America's

Future emerged as a result of the rising concern for the plight of new teachers. This commission was chaired by Governor James B. Hunt Jr. of North Carolina and directed by Linda Darling-Hammond, professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. A blue-ribbon panel of 26 public officials, business and community leaders, and educators issued a report in September, 1996, entitled, What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future.

One year later, the Commission released an anniversary report, Doing What Matters Most: Investing in Quality Teaching (1997), which described progress toward its recommendations. They reported that states differ greatly in the levels of funding allocated and standards applied to pre-service and in-service teacher education programs and the extent to which they require or fund induction support programs for new teachers (1996). The commission reported that in 1997, only nine states funded induction programs that provided a structured program for new teachers, including trained, state-funded mentors (Darling-Hammond, 1999).

The Columbia Group, supported by the BellSouth Foundation and SERVE, embraced the findings of this Commission and extended the Commission's work. As an initial step, the Columbia Group (2000) examined teachers and teaching in the Southeast. Highlights of the findings of this group included: (a) no state in the region had developed a comprehensive program designed to attract, prepare, and retain top quality teachers, though there were exemplary programs addressing individual components; (b) none of the southeastern states provided the time during the school day necessary for a comprehensive mentoring and induction program; however, most states did have some type of induction program for new teachers, and (c) few of the states were working to insure that new teacher assignments were reasonable and fair.

New Teachers' Work Conditions

Unfortunately, due to their lack of seniority, new teachers were often initially assigned to the most difficult and frustrating work conditions. Many times they were

placed in unsuccessful, low-SES schools where high attrition rates generate the greatest number of teaching positions (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Huling-Austin, 1989; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Rosenholtz, 1985). Research reflecting these challenging work conditions indicated that induction programs cannot overcome the incredible obstacles these teachers encounter each day (Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes, & Paulissen, 1986). Therefore, while induction programs are effective, they cannot be used as a replacement for good administrative decisions.

The U.S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1996) recognized that working conditions play an integral role in the high attrition rates of American teachers. In other studies, Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik (1985) and Darling-Hammond (1999) reached a similar conclusion. These authors indicated that the interventions provided through the induction program were not powerful enough to resolve the problems the teachers encountered in a difficult teaching assignment.

Workload, pay scales, school and district support for staff development, school decision making, safety in schools, student readiness to learn, and the levels of public respect for teachers were all determining factors in a teacher's decision to stay or leave the profession (Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1986). These issues must be addressed by legislators, administrators, school district boards of education, and state boards of education rather than induction programs. In the absence of planned induction programs, the national attrition rate for new teachers could escalate and rival the student dropout rate (Reinhartz, 1989).

Psychologically, Fuller (1969) developed a theory of teacher concerns stating that teachers progress through a series of four stages as they begin their teaching career. He labeled these stages as "fantasy, survival, mastery, and the impact stage." The first two stages are the primary concern of the new teacher. Fuller contended that new teachers' stages of concern shift from an initial focus on survival to a primary focus on student learning.

Rosenholtz (1989) identified critical dimensions of the social organization of schools associated with teacher commitment. She suggested that teachers must have internal motivation in order to experience success within the isolated social structure of a classroom. Organizational social psychologists hypothesized that if people were highly motivated, they would perform at a higher level than if they experience low internal motivation (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Rosenholtz concluded that, for work to be satisfying and motivating, people must have knowledge of the success of their efforts.

Obviously, salary was a legislative issue that is very rarely affected by educators, except through lobbying efforts. The status of the profession was primarily a result of societal conditions and the value citizens place on education. Also, opportunities for advancement in the teaching profession were minimal and were largely a result of the limited career ladder offered to educators (Schlechty & Vance, 1983). Teachers can teach or return to school to secure advanced degrees to specialize or become administrators or educators in higher education.

Induction Roots in Other Fields

Although the concept of mentoring is somewhat new to the field of education, many professions have utilized mentoring experiences to support new employees' entrance into the profession. Many mentoring programs in schools have been patterned after programs in the business world (Bishop, 1997). Businesses across the globe have effectively used the tool of mentoring to socialize their new employees and to assist them with goal advancement.

Induction practices through the use of mentoring were noted as being quite prevalent in other professions such as business, medicine, and social and public services (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Fagan & Walter, 1982; Darling-Hammond, Berry, Haselkorn & Fideler, 1999). Lortie (1975) identified mediated entry into a profession as the primary vehicle of induction into the workforce. The concept of mediated entry can be observed in clerkships in law firms and internships and residencies in the medical field. Through this

process, the new employee was incrementally guided through the field by experienced personnel within the organization. The new employee was gradually introduced to new techniques, assignments, and situations by a person who has attained respect within the organization. Lortie recognized the student teaching experience as serving this function within the field of education. However, Lortie emphasized that student teaching is much shorter in duration than mentoring in other fields and was comparatively less uniform in its structure.

Definitions of Teacher Induction

In the past two decades, the concept of teacher induction has received much attention. Educators and researchers have identified many different definitions of induction. Reinhartz defined induction as the "process of welcoming and helping beginners adjust to their new roles as in-service teachers" (1989, p. 4). McDonald and Elias (1980) characterized induction as adaptation to the social system of the school and the mastery of effective teaching skills. The purpose of these programs was to increase the new teacher's knowledge, to improve teaching effectiveness, and to increase the retention of larger numbers of highly qualified teachers.

Huling-Austin, Odell, Ishler, Kay, and Edelfelt (1989) defined the induction process as "a transitional period in teacher education, between pre-service preparation and continuing professional development, during which assistance may be provided and/or assessment may be applied to beginning teachers" (p. 3). Reinhartz stated that the induction process "can be considered the mortar that cements pre-service training to continued in-service professional development" (1989, p. 4). Eye (1956) characterized the process as including all activities and efforts to assist new employees in adapting satisfactorily to the unfamiliar work and social environment.

Lawson (1992) analyzed the historical evolution of the definition of induction during the past 20 years. He focused on the new definition of induction that revolved around an intensive, organized, assistance program available to serve as a support system

for new teachers. He argued that, although this is a worthwhile endeavor that certainly should be continued, this process would be more appropriately labeled as an "organizational assistance and initiation program" (p. 170).

Lawson believed that the concept of induction should be reserved for the ongoing development and inculturation of a teacher. He argued that in the process of developing these pre-packaged induction programs educators have neglected the changing new teacher's needs. He suggested that teaching is an intellectual, moral, and political endeavor and that many current induction programs focus attention on developing each teacher's technical competencies at the expense of ignoring other vital aspects of development (1992).

For the purposes of this study, new teacher induction programs were defined as formal, planned experiences and activities designed and implemented by school districts to facilitate new teachers' transitions from student teacher to competent classroom teacher. Regardless of the specific adopted definition, the induction period of a new teacher to his or her career is important to success.

History of the New Teacher Induction Program

Formal teacher induction programs were implemented across the nation in response to the high attrition rates of new teachers. In a historical work, Eye and Lane (1956) proposed a method of assisting new teachers in making a smooth transition from their guarded experiences of pre-service teaching to the demands of the classroom. Eye and Lane stated, "The school should have some organized means of helping all new teachers for an extended time" (p. 325). Theoretically, this support structure facilitated the transition from student teacher to competent classroom teacher (Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1986).

Originally, many induction programs evolved from the concern that traditional teacher education programs were not adequately preparing teachers for the realities of the classroom. Amazingly, the literature supports that, as early as 1809, programs existed to

support new teachers (Elias, Fisher, & Simon, 1980). However, Reinhartz (1989) argued that historically, teachers in the United States have received sparse systematic induction assistance. The results of a three-year study on the induction of new teachers conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals indicated, "No other important profession is so careless about the induction of its new members" (Hunt, 1968, p. 135).

As of 1998, more than 300 schools of education in the United States offered programs extending beyond the traditional 4-year bachelor's degree program. These programs provided a year-long school-based internship combined with professional development and subject-matter coursework (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Interestingly, research indicated graduates of extended programs were more satisfied with their preparation, were viewed by administrators and colleagues as better prepared, and were much more likely to continue in their chosen career than their peers prepared in traditional four-year programs (Andrew & Schwab, 1995).

Countries such as Belgium, Germany, and Luxembourg have long required 2 or 3 years of graduate work before releasing teachers into the workforce. In 1989, France and Japan mandated major teacher education reforms extending both collegiate and school-based training. In France, all prospective teachers currently complete a graduate program in University Institutes that are connected to nearby schools. In Japan, first-year teachers complete a year-long supervised internship with a reduced teaching load providing time for mentoring and supplementary study (Darling-Hammond, 1998).

Reinhartz (1989) believed the process of teacher induction should be recognized as a method of revitalizing the teaching profession and agreed that it should be ongoing and comprehensive. Bercik and Blair-Larsen (1989) recommended, "If teacher induction is to be successful, it must be reactive to the needs of the teachers it is serving and reflective of positive educational strategies" (p. 11).

Fortunately, since the early 1980s, the number of state and local school districts that have initiated programs for new teachers has risen substantially, but the components of these programs vary significantly (Sclan & Darling-Hammond, 1992). In 1984 only eight states reported initiating, approving, or implementing new teacher induction programs; that number increased to 31 states in 1991 (Gold, 1996) but decreased in 1998 to 26 states and the District of Columbia (Andrews & Andrews, 1998). Many states eliminated programs in response to decreased or restricted funding (Andrews & Andrews).

Critical Components of New Teacher Induction Programs

Various components are often included in induction programs: printed information regarding district and school policies and procedures, orientation seminars, observations with follow-up conferences, assignments of mentors, opportunities to observe other teachers, release time or a reduced teaching load, scheduled support meetings, and training sessions on curriculum, effective instructional practices, classroom management, and discipline (Huling-Austin, 1986). Additionally, Bishop (1997) suggested very basic orientation should occur addressing concerns such as dress code, management of instructional time, student records, classroom arrangement, chain of command, locating resources, and stress management. The fundamental premise of these induction programs is to assist the new teacher with various tasks and duties while socializing them to become a part of the teaching profession (Kling & Brookhart, 1991; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Reinhartz, 1989).

Huling-Austin's and Murphy's research (1987) indicated the following:

1. All school districts should implement an induction program.
2. Support teachers need to be carefully assigned to first-year teachers.
3. Support teachers should receive training in adult motivation, learning, and in how to best serve in this support role.

4. Support teachers need to be compensated for their time and investment in this program.

5. Districts should appreciate that this new teacher induction program should serve as only an initial staff development program and that supplementary and continuous staff development must occur throughout the teacher's career.

6. Districts should be extremely careful in their placement of new teachers.

Jenson (1986) stated:

> Support for beginning teachers is crucial to the development of a strong, committed teaching force. New teachers enter the profession with enthusiasm and an open mind about learning and students. They want to be successful in their classrooms. Programs of support that encourage the sharing of the teacher's craft and knowledge will help to sustain these beginners during the first difficult years. If supported, these new teachers may expand their research for solutions to a multitude of classroom problems. Support programs for beginning teachers are crucial to the development of a stronger, committed teaching force. (p. 34)

Based on her numerous years of research, Huling-Austin (1986) presented a plethora of concepts indicating possible goals and limitations of new teacher induction programs. The author's purpose was to aid program planners in proposing and developing programs based on reasonable expectations for these programs. She stated induction programs can reasonably be expected to (a) improve the teaching performance of first-year teachers, (b) decrease the attrition rates of competent first-year teachers, (c) eliminate the teachers who do not possess the skills necessary for effective teaching, (d) advance the professional and personal prosperity of teachers, and (e) satisfy mandatory guidelines and conditions related to induction and certification.

However, induction programs cannot be expected (a) to overcome critical conditions in the school such as inappropriate teaching assignments, difficult teaching schedules, and overcrowding, (b) to develop into successful teachers those first-year teachers that do not possess the credentials, aptitude, motivation, and interpersonal skills

necessary to become outstanding teachers, and (c) to significantly affect the long-term retention rate of teachers without systemic changes in the larger educational system (Huling-Austin, 1986).

Bercik and Blair-Larsen (1989) recommended the development of a broad-based support system for new teachers and stressed that teacher education programs must be both theoretical and practical in nature. Bercik and Blair-Larsen advocated that induction programs must be responsive to the unique needs of the participants and must proactively address and reinforce effective educational practices. A number of researchers suggested creative and flexible scheduling should be a fundamental component in developing a successful induction program (Camp & Heath-Camp, 1991; Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Veenman, 1984). Still other researchers indicated induction programs should be specific to the context in which the new teacher is assigned to work (Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985).

Colbert and Wolff also recommended support providers and new teachers be compensated for the time they invest in the new teacher induction program (1992; Huling-Austin & Murphy, 1987). These authors, along with Schaffer, Stringfield, and Wolfe (1992), strongly urged universities to collaborate with local school districts in the process, regardless of whether or not external funding is available to support the venture.

Representing another perspective, Hoge's dissertation (1991) compared the perceptions held by new teachers, mentor teachers, and administrators regarding the effectiveness of the teacher induction program in Pennsylvania. Interestingly, the new teachers' ratings were significantly lower than the mentor teachers' and administrators' ratings. This discrepancy indicated that even though the administrators and mentor teachers perceived the induction program as meeting the needs of novice teachers, the new teachers did not report that the program adequately met their needs during their first year of teaching.

Exemplary Support Programs for New Teachers

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) recommended reinventing teacher preparation and professional development by creating extended preparation programs that include a year-long internship in a professional development school (Darling-Hammond, 1999). Studies have found teachers prepared in extended teacher education programs remain in the profession at higher rates than teachers in traditional four-year programs (Andrew & Schwab, 1995). This commission also recommended that states create high-quality induction programs for new teachers.

In recent years, numerous states have made efforts towards strengthening their new teacher induction program. The Kansas Goals 2000 Early Career Professional Development Program was a collaborative effort between universities, the Southeast Education Service Center, and 68 Kansas school districts. This program provides a seamless system of professional development for new teachers throughout their first 3 years of their career (Runyan, White, Hazel, & Hedges, 1998).

In another state, The Kentucky Teacher Internship Program was designed to provide assistance to new teachers. All new teachers and out-of-state teachers with less than 2 years of successful teaching experience who are seeking initial certification in Kentucky are required to serve a 1 year internship. A trained resource teacher is required to invest a minimum of 70 hours working with the new teacher. In Kentucky, the new teacher is observed a minimum of nine times per year (URL http://www.kde.state.ky.us/otec/intern/ktip/kTipQ&A.asp).

Landmark studies of new teacher induction programs have been generated in states such as California, New Jersey, North Carolina, Connecticut, Kansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Texas. Each of these studies, along with other literature, supports the need for induction programs and emphasizes the importance of including effective induction practices, as indicated by the research, in these programs.

Linda Darling-Hammond (1999) encouraged districts to support high-quality induction models by adopting models for mentoring programs like those programs which have been successful in Cincinnati, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Seattle, Washington; Rochester, New York, and elsewhere. She recommended establishing teacher academies which offer continuous courses, institutes, and teacher-initiated learning opportunities. She suggested that universities and schools collaborate together to initiate summer institutes in content pedagogical areas followed up with focus groups throughout the year to assist teachers in developing and implementing effective instructional techniques in the classroom. Her final recommendation was for districts to restructure their time in schools to allow a minimum of 10 hours each week for collaborative planning, development of lesson plans and curriculum, and peer observation for new teachers and their mentors.

The Role of Administrators in the New Teacher Induction Process

Administrators have the primary responsibility for establishing the tone of the working environment for the new teacher (Brock & Grady, 1996). The new teacher must perceive he or she is a welcomed and a valued member of the school team (Morgan & Ashbaker, 2000: Vann, 1989). The building principal must consistently demonstrate support for the success and professional growth of the novice teacher (Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Hughes, 1994; Loucks, 1993; Macdonald, 1999).

Administrators must carefully assign new teachers to teaching assignments where they can experience success, rather than schools or classrooms which are labeled challenging or impossible (Holmes Group, 1986). Additionally, building-level administrators must be wise and discerning in their selection of an appropriate mentor for the new teacher (Bishop, 1997). "The prevailing admonition is to choose mentors carefully" (Jones & Walters, 1994, p. 143). Additionally, the administrators should provide adequate time for informal and formal conferencing and planning between the new teacher and the mentor (Huffman & Leak, 1986; Loucks, 1993). Teachers need to be empowered with discretion and autonomy to make important classroom choices; however,

clear goals and expectations must be established collaboratively by administrators and the new teacher (Loucks). Frequent and helpful feedback and encouragement must be provided on a regular basis by the building-level leaders responsible for supervising the novice teacher (Vann, 1989).

Kling and Brookhart (1991) recommended inservice training be mandated not only for the mentors, but also for the administrators supervising new teachers. They suggested this training should address issues such as characteristics of effective mentors, development of a mentor-mentee relationship, the need for confidentiality, and the importance of providing a positive school climate. Administrators play an integral role in the success or failure of a new teacher (Bishop, 1997; Vann, 1989). Research repeatedly indicated the role of administrators in this process cannot be underestimated. These school leaders played a significant role in determining the success or failure of a new teacher (Anzul, 2000).

The Role of Mentoring in the New Teacher Induction Process

Another significant factor in the retention of new teachers is the practice of providing the new teacher with a mentor (Anzul, 2000; Andrews & Andrews, 1998; Gold, 1996; Portner, 1998).

> Anderson and Shannon (1987) defined mentoring as: a nurturing process in which a more skilled or more experienced person, serving as a role model, teaches, sponsors, encourages, counsels, and befriends a less skilled or less experienced person for the purpose of promoting the latter's professional and/or personal development. (p. 38)

Successful mentoring programs are dependent upon the quality of training available to the mentors (Anzul, 2000; Ganser & Koskela, 1997). Several common characteristics of successful mentor-mentee relationships have been documented in the literature. Schmoll (1983) found these qualities include compatibility, similar values, trust, acceptance, similar levels of commitment, openness, and caring. Kay and Sabatini (1988) concurred with these findings and additionally stressed the importance of confidentiality

when relating to the new teacher. Inexperienced teachers must be able to confide their weaknesses, anxieties, and concerns to their mentors without fear of reprisal (Runyan, 1999). Ganser (1991) reported that mentors and mentees ideally should be chosen within similar grade levels, subject areas, and have accessibility to one another. Additionally, the process of mentoring was referred to as collegial pairing (Heck & Blaine, 1989). Heck and Blaine emphasized the necessity of a mentor or colleague serving in a supportive, rather than an evaluative, role. Mentoring functions were implemented within the context of an ongoing, caring relationship between the mentor and mentee (Anzul, 2000; Huffman & Leak, 1986; Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 1999).

Additionally, Tellez's (1992) research strongly supported the concept of self-selection of a mentor by a new teacher. The research in his study indicated when individuals seek assistance, they prefer to choose their supporters. He suggested the possibility of allowing first-year teachers to establish relationships with several teachers and then empower them personally to select a compatible mentor.

Wildman, Magliaro, Niles, and Niles (1992) suggested because of the highly personal nature of the mentor-mentee relationship, the roles of mentoring should be defined by the individuals involved in implementing such a program rather than rigidly specified by bureaucrats or politicians. Also, the authors stressed that the mentoring program should not serve as a substitute for an ongoing staff development program. However, the authors concluded that if the program was implemented correctly, mentors could provide a comprehensive support system for new teachers which could complement a carefully designed induction program.

Odell and Ferraro's research (1992) demonstrated that new teachers who were still teaching after 4 years most appreciated the emotional support received from their mentors during the initial year of teaching. Their research data indicated teacher mentoring may reduce the early departure of new teachers from the profession. The report issued by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future in 1996 indicated that mentored

teachers tended to leave teaching at a lower rate than those new teachers who were not provided a mentor for support. The report also indicated new teachers who were provided mentoring support were more effective in helping students learn.

In 1998, 26% of teachers in the United States reported being involved in a formal relationship mentoring another teacher and 19% of teachers reported being mentored (Condition of Education, 1999). Significantly, 70% of teachers who were mentored by another teacher at least once a week reported that this activity was highly beneficial and they reported that the collaboration positively affected their teaching practices (Condition of Education).

On a broader base, across the nation, from classrooms to faculty lounges, from district board meetings to legislative agendas, leaders are recognizing the merit of mentoring (Jones & Walters, 1994; Portner, 1998; Reinhartz, 1989). A master teacher can serve as a significant resource to a new teacher who is full of questions but possesses few answers (Love & Rowland, 1999; Runyan, 1999). Release time or stipends are often offered to mentors to compensate for the time, energy, and the planning time they invest in the new teacher (Halford, 1998). These tangible incentives also lend credibility, value, and importance to the program.

The Role of Mentoring in the State of Georgia

A statewide program designed to support new teachers was initiated in Georgia in 1979 (McDonald, 1980). Bishop reported Georgia was the first state in the nation to design and implement a teacher induction program (1997). The Georgia Beginning Teacher Program provided assessment, development, and certification. Georgia's program for new teachers changed when a revised rule for the Georgia Mentor Teacher Program (GMTP) was adopted by the State Board of Education in August 1997. The revised rule required all local school districts to submit a Mentor Teacher Application to the Georgia Department of Education by May 1 of each school year. In addition, all

participating school districts were required to develop and maintain a mentor teacher plan (Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07, 1997).

The purpose of the Georgia Mentor Teacher Program was to provide peer support and guidance to new teachers in local school districts during their induction years. The goals were as follows: (a) assist mentee teachers with the effective performance of their responsibilities; (b) increase teacher retention and lower teacher turnover rates; and (c) assist new teachers in improving their instructional and classroom management practices and techniques (Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07, 1997).

Linda Schrenko, State Superintendent of Schools in Georgia, November 1994 to present, along with many of her predecessors, has requested additional funding for the Mentor Teacher Program each year during the budget planning process. According to Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07 (1997), mentors in the state of Georgia are provided stipends or remuneration for a minimum of 15 hours of work with one or more mentee teachers. These stipends are contingent upon appropriations by the Georgia General Assembly each year.

During the first year of funding for this program, $365,000 was allocated by the General Assembly to compensate 899 mentors with 979 mentees. This allocation allowed for a $250 stipend per mentor unit (Georgia Mentor Teacher Program press release, September 2000). The mentor program for FY 99-00 was funded in the amount of $1.25 million per year for 3,032 mentors with 3,721 protégés allowing for a $162 stipend per mentor unit (Georgia Mentor Teacher Program press release, September 2000). Individual stipends are awarded based on computations of the statewide total of mentor quarters divided into the funding appropriation (Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07, 1997). Therefore, the amount the mentor teacher gets paid depends on participating school districts, and the amount differs from year to year. A maximum of three units per mentor is allowed in each school year. There were 99 participating school

districts in 1991-92 and 130 participating school districts in 1999-2000 (Georgia Mentor Teacher Program press release, September 2000).

The GMTP for new teacher induction includes a person serving in the role of mentor to every new teacher in the state of Georgia. The mentor is assigned by the building-level administrator to provide support for the new teacher throughout the year. Teachers interested in serving as a mentor in the state of Georgia must possess 3 years of teaching experience. Teachers selected to serve as a mentor or Teacher Support Specialist (TSS) in Georgia are required to complete a 100 clock-hour training sequence which is divided into a 50 clock-hour instructional course and a 50-clock hour internship (Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07, 1997).

Barriers to New Teacher Induction Programs

Teacher induction programs cannot be expected to overcome major problems in the educational process such as misplacements, negative school climate, poor administrative selection of mentors, and ineffective administrative supervision and support (Hoffman, Edwards, O'Neal, Barnes, & Paulissen, 1986). However, induction programs can reduce teacher turnover and increase teacher efficacy if the workplace conditions are ones which support the new teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1986)

Leslie Huling-Austin (1986) concluded induction programs can reasonably be expected to increase teacher retention during the induction years; but most likely, these programs will not increase the long-term retention of teachers. Numerous factors contribute to teachers leaving the profession. These include, among others, salary, status of the profession, limited opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession, and conditions in the workplace (Schlechty & Vance, 1983). These factors, individually and certainly in combination, are more powerful than the influence of induction programs (Huling-Austin). As a result, it is unreasonable for educators to expect induction programs in isolation to have long-term effects on the retention of effective teachers.

Induction programs cannot be a pre-programmed package. Huling-Austin, Putman, and Galvez-Hjornevik (1985) recommended that induction programs should be structured as flexible enough to accommodate the emerging needs and concerns of the participants (Camp & Heath-Camp, 1991; Darling-Hammond, 1999). Bringaze (1988) suggested that a program improvement plan be included in every induction program. She suggested this practice would encourage evaluation and refinement of the program on an ongoing basis in order to continue to meet individual needs and program goals.

Huling-Austin (1985) suggested mandated induction programs often limit their scope of effectiveness by meeting only the minimum standards established by the state. She believed this tendency argues further for a careful examination of program content and results in induction programs throughout the nation. Ashburn (1987) argued there is a need for a comparative examination of new teacher induction programs.

New Teacher Induction Programs in the State of Georgia

Georgia was not immune to the national trend of teachers leaving the profession. More and more promising teachers are exiting the profession early when they realize assistance is inadequate or nonexistent. If a new teacher realizes that he or she must make his curriculum, discipline, and teaching strategies work all by himself, there is no incentive to stay and try to overcome the difficulties.

Since the majority of school districts in the state of Georgia were classified as rural, it seemed logical to examine the unique opportunities and challenges presented to rural districts in the design and implementation of an induction program. The problems of developing and implementing a program for new teachers in rural districts appeared to present more problems than operating such a program in metropolitan areas (Bruelle & Allred, 1991).

Many districts hire only one or two new teachers a year. Often school district administrators find that it is not economically feasible or practical to institute a full-scale, comprehensive program of support for only one or two new teachers. Districts often

collaborate together and offer a regional approach to the training. However, in this instance, travel time becomes a significant barrier to the success of the program (Bruelle & Allred, 1991). Bruelle and Allred also cited budget constraints and differences in the expectations of each district as also potentially interfering with the effectiveness of regional programs.

Additionally, the geographic isolation of rural schools often mandated the necessity of mentors being assigned to work with teachers from different subject areas (Bruelle & Allred, 1991). The review of literature indicated a significant absence of information regarding how many rural school districts design and implement new teacher induction programs unless the program was in cooperation with an institution of higher education.

Research describing one exemplary rural support program for new teachers was located. Eastern Illinois University offered a free new teacher program to rural school districts which involved an advisory committee comprised of representatives from the university faculty, local school districts, and local educational service units (Brulle & Allred, 1991). The services sponsored by this committee included the development of a newsletter periodically distributed to new teachers, a monthly individualized educational seminar series located at three regional sites, and non-evaluative classroom observations conducted by the program's coordinator. This program was developed with the intention of serving as a model for possible replication in other rural areas. Brulle and Allred concluded that the major obstacle the program encountered is the extensive travel time required to service the rural areas and the hesitation of first-year teachers to participate in the program after an exhausting day at work.

The state of Georgia has small, medium, and large school districts. No studies were located specifically relating to the size of Georgia's school districts and the effects of this variable on programming support systems for new teachers. However, Goodson-Rochelle's dissertation (1998) assessed the effects of school district size in new teacher induction programs in large and small school districts in Tennessee. She surveyed

new teachers requesting them to rate their induction program as to best practices. Interestingly, no differences were identified in the occurrence of induction activities in large and small school districts.

Talley's (1991) dissertation investigated the extent of induction support provided to Georgia teachers and their perceived need for assistance. The findings of the study indicated that insufficient assistance was provided to the new teachers, and the assistance that was provided was not perceived to be adequate. Talley's research indicated that Georgia teachers had strong instructional needs which were not being met. The highest need for assistance was in the area of discipline followed by help with clerical work. Additional instructional needs identified in her study of new teachers included dealing with individual differences, motivating students, using different teaching methods and strategies effectively, dealing with student problems, and obtaining sufficient materials and supplies. Interestingly, the new teachers did not perceive the induction assistance in the state of Georgia to be adequate in any area except in awareness of school rules and policies. Talley found the average number of orientation sessions was two, at both the building and system levels. The average length of each session was 2.4 hours at the building level and 4 hours at the system level. Talley's study identified that 81.9% of new teachers participated in new teacher orientations at the system level. However, only 57% were involved in orientations at the building level. Talley's study was completed during the 1989-1990 school year and included a random sampling of 270 new Georgia teachers.

Another dissertation investigated why new teachers in a seven-county region of Georgia left public school teaching (Montgomery, 1981). New teachers cited inadequate compensation as the most significant reason for leaving the profession. This reason was followed by excessive work load, student academics and discipline problems, and lack of support from competent administrators.

Nelda Bishop (1997) completed an extensive study into the priorities that Georgia principals and new teachers place on interpersonal and professional characteristics utilized

to identify experienced teachers to enlist as mentors for new teachers. Her study results indicated there was strong agreement between principals and new teachers with respect to the characteristics and concerns which should be considered in the selection and assignment of mentors to assist new teachers. While the mentoring program was considered to be only one component of the new teacher induction program described in this study, it was designed to be the cornerstone of Georgia's program to assist new teachers into the profession.

Summary

Due to the burgeoning population of students, the nation will need over 2 million additional teachers during the next 10 years. Research also indicated that approximately 20% of new teachers leave the profession in the first 3 years, and 9.3% quit before finishing their first year. This high rate of teacher turnover was compounded by rising student enrollments and the aging teaching force. It is imperative that these new teachers be provided support to ensure their continuation in the field.

Formal teacher induction programs were implemented across the nation in response to the high attrition rates of new teachers. Various components were often included in induction programs. The fundamental premise of these induction programs was to assist the new teacher with various tasks and duties while socializing them to become a part of the teaching profession. The literature indicated the early experiences of teachers influence both the retention rates of teachers and the effectiveness of their teaching. Teacher induction programs can be an effective and positive force in our educational system today. They are not, however, a panacea to solve deeper problems within a school, but if the programs are properly implemented and supervised, they can be expected to contribute to the process of retaining effective teachers.

In response to the aging teaching force, critical shortage of teachers in some disciplines, and the rising student enrollment rates, educational leaders must address the

needs of those entering the profession. It is imperative that induction programs be comprehensive, flexible, ongoing, and meet the needs of new teachers.

The difficulties faced by new teachers have a profound effect on the students in our schools, thus affecting our entire society. However, the problems new teachers face are not insurmountable. Research indicates that effective support programs can be generated and implemented by school districts to assist new teachers as they progress through their careers. While teacher induction programs will not solve all educational problems, they can be an effective tool in retention of new teachers if utilized correctly by school districts.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The focus of this research was to determine the perceptions of new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia. Specifically, the researcher explored what induction assistance is provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia, as well as the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers. The research will be used to establish if the induction assistance provided is adequate to meet the needs of new teachers in the state of Georgia. This chapter includes a description of subjects, a description of the questionnaire and research questions used, procedures, and data analysis.

Research Questions

This study was designed to answer the following overarching research question: What are the perceptions of new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia? This study was conducted to investigate the specific activities offered in the new teacher induction program in the state of Georgia.

1. What were the needs of assistance as perceived by new teachers in the state of Georgia?
2. What assistance was provided to new teachers in school districts across the state of Georgia to induct new teachers in the following areas: (a) socialization into the school environment and culture, (b) special consideration in assignments, and (c) professional needs?
3. What were the perceptions of new teachers about the adequacy of existing induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia?

4. What differences, if any, existed in the needs of the teachers among the categories of the following variables: (a) college-degree level, (b) institution from which the participant graduated, and (c) grade level of teaching position?
5. What recommendations, if any, did new teachers have for modifying or improving the induction program in the state of Georgia?

Research Design

The design of the study was ex-post facto research. This research design recognizes that the research process cannot be manually controlled, nor can the independent variables be manipulated. All the independent variables existed prior to the study. The basic purpose of ex-post facto research is to discover or establish casual or functional relationships among variables.

Participants

The population for this study were new teachers in Georgia who completed their first year of teaching during the 1999-2000 school year. The participants were directed to answer the survey based on their experiences during their first year of teaching and not based upon their experiences as a second-year teacher. The survey population was derived from the Certified Personnel Information (CPI) file generated through information provided to the Georgia Department of Education by each school system in Georgia. The personnel database was provided to the researcher by the Georgia Professional Practices Commission (Appendix A). The survey was cross-sectional, measuring the characteristics of a sample at one point in time (Creswell, 1994; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

Of the 2,226 teachers hired in the state of Georgia during the 1999-2000 school year, 1,120 (50%) were identified as elementary teachers, 508 (23%) were middle school, 414 (19 %) were high school level, and 184 (8%) were identified as "other." The population identified by the researcher as "other" included those teachers who could not be identified by grade level from the database. These individuals included music, visual arts, chorus, and P-12 special education teachers across the state. In order to identify a

population representative of the state, a percentage of teachers was randomly selected from each teaching level. Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table, the researcher determined the study's target sample size from the population to be 327. From Georgia's population of full-time new teachers, 500 subjects were identified by random selection. These included 250 elementary teachers, 115 middle school educators, 95 high school teachers, and 40 teachers from the "other" category.

Each subject in this population of full-time new teachers was assigned a number. A Table of Random Numbers (McClave, Benson, & Sincich, 2001) was used to identify survey participants. The randomly chosen numbers were matched to corresponding assigned numbers of population subjects to identify the sample for this study. A return rate of 65.4% was obtained. This yielded a total of 327 subjects for which data were analyzed.

Instrumentation

Since the targeted population for this study was new teacher induction program participants across the state of Georgia, the most direct and inclusive method to collect data in a timely manner was the survey method. The use of a survey offered numerous advantages over other research methods: speed, anonymity, ability of participants to answer questions at their convenience, ability to cover a large geographical area, lack of interviewer bias, efficiency, and lower cost (Borg & Gall, 1989). Survey instruments enabled the researcher to generalize from a sample to a population (Babbie, 1990). The utilization of quantitative data analysis was justified to determine components of programs across the state and the perception of new teachers regarding their needs of assistance in these programs.

Additionally, the survey identified the perceptions of new teachers concerning the effectiveness of existing induction activities in their school districts and enabled respondents to identify other program features they perceived as strengthening their programs in the future. Finally, respondents were asked to identify demographic

information to assist the researcher in describing the populations in which the practices occur.

Items included in the survey were based upon current practices in new teacher induction programs across the United States and common components of effective programs identified in the literature. Additionally, the survey addressed commonalities in the research literature regarding problems of new teachers and focused on the unique needs of new teachers. The instrument used in this study was a multiple-response questionnaire developed by Shelby Talley in 1990 (Appendix C) during her doctoral studies at The University of Alabama (Talley, 1991). Talley provided written permission for her survey to be revised and used in this study in September 2000 (Appendix B).

Validity was established by a panel of experts prior to the administration of the original survey by Talley in 1990 (Talley, 1991). Georgia Teacher Support Specialist (TSS) trainers, system-level program supervisors, researchers, dissertation committee members, and published authors on teacher induction programs were invited to improve upon the instrument for content validity. The instrument was revised to reflect their recommendations.

Pilot testing of the instrument occurred in 1990 to help establish the content and face validity of the instrument and to improve upon the researcher's clarity of directions, adequacy of questions, and additional concerns that might influence the validity of the results obtained from the study (Talley, 1991). A sample of 20 new teachers completed the instrument, and the researcher made changes based upon the findings.

Reliability testing occurred in the spring of 1990, but Talley did not include the results in her dissertation and was unable to locate the documentation to support the test (per phone conversation in January, 2001). Therefore, the researcher assumed the instrument was acceptable and used the data generated from the current study to retest the instrument simultaneously with data analysis in the spring of 2001. Cronbach's alpha is a widely used statistical technique for computing test score reliability (Gall, Borg, & Gall,

1996). Reliability coefficients range from 0.00 (no reliability) to 1.00 (perfect reliability). Generally, an acceptable rate of reliability among researchers is considered to be .80 or higher (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Using SPSS Graduate Pack 8.0 for Windows, a reliability analysis was conducted simultaneously with data analysis in May 2001. For the 26 items relating to new teacher needs, there was an alpha reliability co-efficient of .9358. For the 26 items determining the assistance provided to new teachers, there was an alpha reliability co-efficient of .9326. These results indicated the questionnaire met the criteria predetermined for reliability.

The researcher made only minor modifications of Talley's original instrument (Appendix D). The following change was made: one additional piece of demographic information was included in the survey. If the survey participant was a graduate of a teacher education program, the researcher asked the individual to indicate the location of the program (Question 4). This addition enabled the researcher to compare data regarding various teacher education programs. Also, the researcher added three additional questions regarding technology. Questions 52, 53, and 54 reflect the classroom teachers' needs for technology as a management tool, teaching resource, and as an instructional tool.

Additionally, questions regarding the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) were modified or deleted as necessary based on the fact that this program was eliminated in the state of Georgia in the summer of 1990. The researcher also asked the survey participant to identify the number of times the new teacher met with his or her mentor for the purposes of instructional planning during the first month of the teacher induction program (Question #55) and after the first month of teaching (Question #56). Finally, the survey participant was asked to identify future recommendations for his or her district's new teacher induction program in Questions 57 and 58. An item analysis was presented in Table I aligning the survey questions with the review of literature, and comparing Talley's original survey with the researcher's revised instrument.

Table I

Item Analysis for Survey to Determine New Teacher Induction Practices in the State of Georgia

Survey Questions	Research Questions	Alignment to Literature	Talley's Instrument
1. Grade Level Taught Last Year	4c	Darling-Hammond (1999), Darling-Hammond (1998), Talley (1991), National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996)	1
2. Certification Status	4a	Darling-Hammond (1999), Darling-Hammond (1998), National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996)	*
3. Are you a graduate of a teacher education program?	4b	Darling-Hammond (1998), National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996), Andrew & Schwab (1995)	3
4. If so, what institution?	4b	Darling-Hammond (1998), National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996), Andrew & Schwab (1995)	*
5. For the beginning teacher, orientation sessions were held at the school building to explain school practices and procedures.	2a	Huling-Austin (1986), Talley (1991), Darling-Hammond (1999)	5
6. For the beginning teacher, orientations were held at the school building to explain local school practices and procedures.	2a	Talley (1991), Loucks (1993), Huffman & Leak (1986), Bishop (1997), Huling-Austin (1986)	6
7. A Beginning or New Teacher handbook was provided (a manual designed specifically for first-year teachers).	2c	Huling-Austin (1986), Talley (1991), National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996)	7
8. For the beginning teacher, an experienced teacher was assigned to serve as a mentor to the new teacher.	2a	Bishop (1997), Jones & Walters (1994), Portner (1998)	8

Table I (continued)

Survey Questions	Research Questions	Alignment to Literature	Talley's Instrument
9. The school system had a formal Mentoring Program	2c	Bishop (1997), Jones & Walters (1994), Portner (1998)	9
10. The beginning teacher was introduced to support personnel in the school.	2a	Bishop (1997), Jones & Walters (1994), Portner (1998)	10
11. The beginning teacher was introduced to support personnel in the school.	2a	McDonald & Elias (1986), Bishop (1997), Talley (1991)	11
12. For the beginning teacher, special assistance in securing housing was offered.	2a	Talley (1991)	12
13. For the beginning teacher, information about the community was provided.	2a	Portner (1998), Huling-Austin, Putman, Galvez-Hjornevik (1985)	13
14. With beginning teachers, the principal scheduled meetings during the first few weeks of school.	2c	Loucks (1993), Vann (1989), Anzul (2000)	14
15. A clearly articulated set of norms or expectations of the teachers employed in the system was evident during recruitment/employment.	2a	Loucks (1993), Vann (1989), Anzul (2000)	15
16. Were you provided textbooks, curriculum guides, etc., prior to preplanning week?	2c	Huling-Austin (1986), Bishop (1997), Talley (1991)	16
17. As a beginning teacher, was special consideration given to student assignments made to you, eg. known discipline problems, special needs students, etc.?	2b	Darling-Hammond (1999), Huling-Austin (1989), National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996), Huling-Austin & Murphy (1987)	17
18. As a beginning teacher, were you provided with reduced work loads through fewer classes as compared to experienced teachers?	2b	Huling-Austin & Murphy (1987), Portner (1998), Galvez-Hjornevik (1985), Darling-Hammond (1999), Huling-Austin, Putman, & Galvez-Hjornevik (1985)	18

Table I (continued)

Survey Questions	Research Questions	Alignment to Literature	Talley's Instrument
19. As a beginning teacher, were you given reduced class sizes as compared to experienced teachers?	2b	Huling-Austin & Murphy (1987), Chase (1998), Huling-Austin (1988), Lortie (1975)	19
20. As a beginning teacher, were you provided reduced non-teaching duties and responsibilities as compared to experienced teachers?	2b	Holmes Group (1986), Chase (1998), Huling-Austin (1988), Lortie (1975)	20
21. Were you assigned a teaching area that matched your background and training?	2b	Holmes Group (1986), Chase (1998), Huling-Austin (1988), Lortie (1975)	21
22. Were you assigned your own classroom as opposed to "floating" between classrooms?	2b	Holmes Group (1986), Chase (1998), Huling-Austin (1988), Lortie (1975)	22
23. Were you provided opportunities to observe experienced teachers?	2c	Holmes Group (1986), Chase (1998), Huling-Austin (1988), Lortie (1975)	23
24. Were you provided opportunities to attend in-service/staff development activities designed specifically for beginning teachers?	2c	Huling-Austin (1987), Murphy (1986), Jenson (1986)	24
25. Were opportunities provided for an experienced teacher to observe you for the purpose of assisting you?	2c	Huling-Austin (1987), Bishop (1997), Huling-Austin & Murphy (1986)	25
26. Has your principal observed in your classroom other than for mandated assessments (GTOI)?	2c	Vann (1989), Loucks (1993), Bishop (1997)	26
27. Were you provided adequate information about the process of teacher evaluation?	2c	Vann (1989), Loucks (1993), Bishop (1997)	27
28. Were you provided adequate feedback about your performance during the teacher evaluation(s)?	2c	Vann (1989), Loucks (1993), Bishop (1997)	29

Table I (continued)

Survey Questions	Research Questions	Alignment to Literature	Talley's Instrument
29. Classroom discipline	1,3	Huling-Austin (1986), Bishop (1997), Darling-Hammond (1999), Veenman (1984)	31
30. Motivating students	1,3	Darling-Hammond (1999), Veenman (1984), Talley (1991)	32
31. Dealing with individual differences.	1,3	Bercik & Blair-Larsen (1989), Talley (1991), Veenman (1984)	33
32. Assessing students' work	1,3	Bishop (1997), Talley (1991),Veenman (1984)	34
33. Relating with parents	1,3	Talley (1991), Darling-Hammond (1999), Veenman (1984)	35
34. Organizing classwork (content)	1,3	Bishop (1997), Talley (1991),Veenman (1984)	36
35. Obtaining materials and supplies	1,3	Bishop (1997), Loucks (1993),Veenman (1984)	37
36. Dealing with problems of individual students	1,3	Huling-Austin (1986), Talley (1991), Veenman (1984)	38
37. Preparation time	1,3	Bishop (1997), Darling-Hammond (1999), Veenman (1984)	39
38. Relating with other teachers	1,3	Brock & Grady (1996), Morgan & Ashbaker (2000), Veenman (1984)	40
39. Planning lessons and class activities	1,3	Bishop (1997), Huling-Austin (1986), Veenman (1984)	41
40. Effective use of different teaching methods or strategies	1,3	Huling-Austin (1986), Talley (1991), Veenman (1984)	42
41. Awareness of school policies and rules.	1,3	Huling-Austin (1986), Talley (1991), Veenman (1984)	43
42. Determining learning levels of students	1,3	Talley (1991), Darling-Hammond (1999), Veenman (1984)	44
43. Knowledge of subject matter	1,3	Talley (1991), Darling-Hammond (1999), Veenman (1984)	45
44. Clerical work	1,3	Bishop (1997), Talley (1991),Veenman (1984)	46

Table I (continued)

Survey Questions	Research Questions	Alignment to Literature	Talley's Instrument
45. Relating with principals/administrators	1,3	Darling-Hammond (1999), Vann (1989), Anzul (2000), Loucks (1993), Veenman (1984)	47
46. Obtaining adequate school equipment	1,3	Bishop (1997), Talley (1991),Veenman (1984)	48
47. Working with slow learners	1,3	Darling-Hammond (1999), Talley (1991), Veenman (1984)	49
48. Working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds	1,3	Veenman (1984), Huling-Austin, Putman, Galvez-Hjornevik (1985)	50
49. Using textbooks/curriculum guides	1,3	Veenman (1984), Darling-Hammond (1999), Bishop (1997)	51
50. Efficient use of time	1,3	Veenman (1984), Darling-Hammond (1999), Bishop (1997)	52
51. Obtaining guidance and support	1,3	Veenman (1984), Darling-Hammond (1999), Heck & Blaine (1989)	53
52. Using technology as a management tool	1,3	Woolley (1998), Runyan, White, Hazel & Hedges (1998)	*
53. Using technology as a teaching resource	1,3	Linda Darling-Hammond (1998), Woolley (1998), Runyan, White, Hazel & Hedges (1998)	*
54. Using technology as an instructional tool	1,3	Linda Darling-Hammond (1998), Woolley (1998), Runyan, White, Hazel & Hedges (1998)	*
55. How many times did you meet with your mentor teacher for instructional planning activities during the first month of the teacher induction program?	2c	Ganser (1991), Anzul (2000), Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (1999), Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07 (1997)	*
56. How often (approximately) did you meet with your mentor teacher for instructional planning activities after the first month of your teaching?	2c	Condition of Education (1999), Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07 (1997), Bishop (1997)	*

Table I (continued)

Survey Questions	Research Questions	Alignment to Literature	Talley's Instrument
57. Based upon my experience in the new teacher induction program in my school district, I recommend that the program be:	5	Hoge (1991), Bringaze (1988), Ashburn (1987)	*
58. Please make recommendations and suggestions for improvement of the induction program in your school district.	5	Hoge (1991), Bringaze (1988), Ashburn (1987)	*

* These items were not included in Dr. Shelby Talley's original instrument.

Procedures

After securing permission to initiate the study from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) in March 2001 (Appendix H), the researcher mailed the survey evaluating teacher induction programs to 500 randomly selected new teachers across the state of Georgia. The survey identified questions concerning activities in ideal new teacher programs determined by a review of the literature. The information packet included a cover letter (Appendix E), a copy of the survey (Appendix D), and a postage-paid and self-addressed envelope mailed in March 2001. Participants were guaranteed that their responses would remain anonymous and that the data discovered would be reported only in aggregate form. Approximately two weeks after the original mailing, a postcard reminder was sent to the participants (Appendix F). Approximately four weeks later, a second mailing (with an updated cover letter - Appendix G - and replacement survey form) was sent to those who did not respond to the initial mailing. The total administration spanned over a total of 8 weeks. There were a total of 53 surveys returned unopened to the researcher. Notes on many of these unopened envelopes indicated the teachers had moved, resigned, married (hence a new last name) or had been relocated within the district. Therefore, the researcher sent out an additional 53 surveys to enable the total number to equal the initial sample size of 500.

Each survey was coded numerically to assist the researcher in making follow-ups if the original survey was not returned. The respondents were informed of this coding procedure in the cover letter. As questionnaires were returned, the participants were checked against a master list to assist in identifying those new teachers who did not respond to the survey. The researcher made every effort to contact by telephone those individuals not returning the survey. Also, many principals, secretaries, and teachers in the state (personally known by the researcher) were contacted and asked to encourage their new teachers to return the survey.

Analysis of the Data

To provide an answer to the major research question, descriptive statistics were utilized to summarize the data from this study and to describe the patterns of responses. Data were compiled by measures of central tendency (means, standard deviations, and modes) and measures of variability (standard deviation, variance, and range) (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996) using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program (Cronk, 1999). Demographic data generated from the survey respondents were displayed in tables to enable the researcher to analyze characteristics of the sample population. The school districts in the state represented by the returns were also displayed in a table. The following is a description of the data analysis for each of the five research subquestions.

Research Question 1: What were the needs of assistance as perceived by new teachers in the state of Georgia?

To determine the needs of assistance as perceived by new teachers, the data were gathered on Likert-type scales. The opinions relating to the needs of assistance were grouped with responses of 4 = very strong need, 3 = strong need, 2 = moderate need, and 1 = no need. Survey items 29-54 were designed to identify these needs. A mean score was calculated for each needs scale item. The mean scores were then rank ordered for analysis.

Research Question 2: What assistance was provided to new teachers in school districts across the state of Georgia to induct new teachers in the following areas: (a) socialization into the school environment and culture, (b) special consideration in assignments, and (c) professional needs?

Socialization into the school environment and culture (Question 2a) included the new teacher being offered system level orientation, school building orientation, a mentor, a guided tour of the school building, introductions to support personnel in the school, assistance in securing housing, information about the community, and a clearly articulated set of norms or expectations. Special consideration in assignments (Question 2b) included

special consideration in student assignments, a reduction in workload, reduced class sizes, reduced nonteaching duties and responsibilities, being assigned an area reflecting his or her training, and being assigned a classroom as opposed to "floating" between classrooms. Professional needs (Question 2c) were reflected in the new teacher being provided: a new teacher handbook, a formal mentoring program, meetings with the principal, with textbooks and curriculum guides prior to pre-planning week, the opportunity to observe experienced teachers, the opportunity to attend inservice/staff development for new teachers, the opportunity for an experienced teacher to observe him or her, the principal observing other than for mandated assessments, adequate information about the evaluation process, and adequate feedback about his or her classroom performance.

To determine the assistance provided to new teachers, frequencies and percentages were calculated from the responses to the questionnaire items related to each of the areas addressed. Data were displayed in tables for comparison purposes.

Research Question 3: What were the perceptions of new teachers about the adequacy of existing induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia?

To determine the adequacy of assistance provided to new teachers, the data were gathered on a Likert-type scale. The opinions relating to adequacy of assistance provided were grouped with responses of 4 = very adequate, 3 = adequate, 2 = somewhat adequate, 1 = inadequate, and 0 = not provided. Survey items 29-54 were designed to identify the adequacy of existing induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia. A mean score was calculated for each assistance scale item. These mean scores were rank ordered and displayed in table form for comparison purposes.

Research Question 4: What differences, if any, existed in the needs of the teachers among the categories of the following variables: (a) college-degree level, (b) institution from which the participant graduated, and (c) grade level of teaching position?

College-degree level (question 4a) reflected the educational degree the participant has received, whether it be baccalaureate, masters, specialist or doctorate. This

information was obtained from the Professional Practices Commission database. The name of the institution from which the participant graduated was requested in survey question 4. This data enabled the researcher to compare and contrast the needs of participants from various teacher education programs. The participant's level of teaching position was reflected in survey question, identifying the grade level the participant taught last year (primary, elementary, middle, or secondary).

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if significant differences existed among the categories of variables of college-degree level, institution from which the participant graduated, and grade level of teaching position. ANOVA is one of the most useful and adaptable statistical techniques available. A statistical significance level of .05 was used in this study. The "no" responses were eliminated, and the ANOVA procedure was run to determine if the level of college-degree could account for the variance in the responses to the questionnaire items concerning the need for assistance. The same procedure was followed to determine if the institution from which a participant graduated could account for the variance in the response to the questionnaire items concerning the need for assistance. Finally, the same procedure was employed to determine if the level of the teaching position, primary, elementary, middle school, or secondary, could account for the variance in the responses to the questionnaire items concerning the need for assistance. Data were displayed in tables for comparison purposes.

Research Question 5: What recommendations, if any, did new teachers have for modifying or improving the induction program in the state of Georgia?

Questionnaire item 57 was used to identify participants' perceptions regarding the adequacy of the existing induction programs in their respective districts. Frequencies and percentages were calculated from the responses to this item. Questionnaire item 58 was an open-ended qualitative question used to obtain recommendations for modifying or improving Georgia's induction program. In this question, qualitative research techniques

were utilized to analyze the data generated. Data collected as a result of the survey were coded and analyzed by categories of the nature of the data. It was coded according to patterns, relationships, contradictions, similarities, and frequencies. Conclusions were determined and reported from the trends that emerge from the data.

Summary

In this study, the researcher collected and analyzed data from Georgia's new teachers concerning their perceptions of the teacher induction program in the state of Georgia. Five basic research questions were addressed by this study. The researcher modified an instrument developed by Dr. Shelby Talley, which was tested for validity and reliability. The researcher added eight questions in an attempt to illicit more information from the new teachers.

Subjects for this study were new teachers in Georgia who completed their first year of teaching during the 1999-2000 school year. These teachers consisted of primary, elementary, middle, and secondary teachers. From the target population of teachers completing one year of service (2,226), 500 new teachers were randomly selected to participate. A 58-question survey was utilized to generate data. There was one open-ended qualitative question included in the survey. Data was compiled and analyzed through the use of both quantitative and qualitative research techniques.

Measures of central tendency, measures of variability, and ANOVA were used complemented by data coding reflecting patterns, relationships, contradictions, similarities, and frequencies. Likert-type scales were used to identify new teachers' needs of assistance and the adequacy of the assistance provided to them during their first year of teaching. Conclusions were determined and reported from the trends that emerge from the data.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Partly in response to the statistics regarding the high attrition rate of new teachers and the aging teaching force of America, induction programs have been developed in school districts across the nation to assist new teachers in progressing smoothly into their new careers. Other reasons these induction programs were developed reflected the need to improve the teaching performance of first year teachers, the need to eliminate the teachers who do not possess the skills necessary for effective teaching, and to satisfy mandatory guidelines and conditions related to induction and certification (Huling-Austin, 1986). Many of these programs are structured, data-driven, and responsive to the unique needs of new teachers. Unfortunately, many other programs may be less helpful in assisting new teachers into their new profession. Therefore, this study was designed to evaluate the transition of new teachers into the profession by analyzing the perceptions of new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia.

This chapter presents the findings of an analysis of the data received from the program participants who completed the induction program survey. The purpose of this study was to determine what induction assistance is provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia, and what are the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers. The findings relevant to each research question will be addressed in sequential order.

Demographics of the Respondents

Data depicting the demographic information provided by the new teachers are shown in Table II. The researcher did not include questions requesting gender, ethnicity, and highest degree obtained by the participants on the survey since that information was retrievable from the Professional Practices Commission database information. Of the 327 new teachers who returned the questionnaires, the majority, 84.4% (276) were female and

Table II

Demographics for 1999-2000 Georgia New Teacher Survey Respondents

Variable	Value	f	%
Gender	Female	276	84.4
	Male	46	14.1
	Undetermined	5	1.5
Highest Degree	Bachelor's	293	89.6
	Master's	25	7.6
	Undetermined	9	2.8
Ethnicity	White	272	83.2
	Black	35	10.7
	Asian	3	.9
	Multi-racial	1	.3
	Undetermined	16	4.9
Grade Level	Pre-Kindergarten	6	1.8
	Primary (K-2)	100	30.6
	Elementary (Grades 3-5)	82	25.1
	Middle (Grades 6-8)	80	24.5
	High School (Grades 9-12)	57	17.4
	Special Education	2	.6
Certification Status	Certified	316	96.6
	Uncertified	10	3.1
	Undetermined	1	.3
Teacher Education Program Graduate	Yes	315	96.3
	No	11	3.4
	Undetermined	1	.3

Note. N = 327.

14.1% (46) were male with 1.5% (5) not indicating gender. Of the participants, 30.6% (100) were employed at the primary level (Kindergarten-Grade 2), 25.1% (82) taught at the elementary school level (Grades 3-5), 24.5% (80) taught at middle schools (Grades 6-8), and 17.4% (57) were at the secondary level (Grades 9-12). There were 1.8% (6) teachers indicating employment within Georgia's Pre-Kindergarten program and .6% (2) individuals who only identified themselves as special education teachers. These two individuals did not indicate their grade level or indicated multiple levels of employment.

There were 89.6% (293) indicating they had received a bachelor's degree, 7.6% (25) identifying themselves as possessing a master's degree, and 2.8% (9) were undetermined. Most respondents, 96.3% (315), were graduates of teacher education programs. Of the primary-level respondents, 96 were teacher education graduates. Of the elementary-level respondents, 80 were teacher education graduates, as were 79 of the middle school respondents. At the secondary level, 52 graduated from teacher education programs. There were only four individuals employed at the primary school level, one individual employed at the elementary level, one at the middle school level, and five individuals at the high school level indicating they were not trained in a teacher education program. Only 3.4% (11) teachers indicated they did not graduate from a teacher education program.

Participants were asked to identify the location of their teacher education program in Question four. There were 35 institutions represented by the participating respondents. Colleges and universities represented were displayed in Table III. There were 11 (3.4%) individuals who did not indicate the location of their teacher education program.

Most of the respondents, 316 (96.6%), indicated they were certified to teach at their grade level. Of the primary-level respondents, 99 were appropriately certified within their employment area. Of the elementary-level respondents, 81 were teaching within their area of certification, as were 77 of the middle school and 53 of the secondary level

Table III

Undergraduate Institutions Attended by 1999-2000 Georgia New Teacher Respondents

Institution	f	%
Albany State University	4	1.2
Armstrong Atlantic University	12	3.7
Augusta State University	13	4.0
Berry College	12	3.7
Bob Jones University	1	.3
Brenau University	16	4.9
Brewton Parker College	5	1.5
Clark Atlanta University	1	.3
Clayton State College and University	3	.9
Columbus State and University	7	2.1
East Tennessee State University	2	.6
Eastern Kentucky University	2	.6
Emmanuel College	4	1.2
Fort Valley State University	1	.3
Georgia College and State University	11	3.4
Georgia Southern University	18	5.5
Georgia Southwestern State University	7	2.1
Georgia State University	25	7.6
Jacksonville State University	3	.9
Kennesaw State University	15	4.6
LaGrange College	1	.3
Mercer University	26	8.0
New Jersey City University	1	.3
North Georgia College and State University	14	4.3
Ohio University	1	.3
Piedmont College	15	4.6
Shorter College	4	1.2
State University of West Georgia	23	7.0
Syracuse University	2	.6
The University of Georgia	37	11.3
Thomas University (Ohio)	3	.9
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	2	.6
University of Tennessee at Knoxville	2	.6
Valdosta State University	23	7.0

respondents. There was one primary, three middle school, four high school, one special education, and one Pre-Kindergarten teacher who indicated they were not certified in the area in which they were employed last year. Only 10 (3.1%) of the surveyed teachers in Georgia were uncertified in their area last year.

Regarding the ethnicity of respondents, 272 (83.2%) were white, 35 (10.7%) were black, 3 (.9%) were Asian, 1 (.3%) was multi-racial, and 16 (4.9%) were unspecified. The information on ethnicity was reported from the new teacher database obtained from the Professional Practices Commission. There were some omissions in the database, hence the limitation in ethnicity data of some of the respondents.

The school districts represented by the returns were identified in Appendix I. There are 180 school districts in the state of Georgia, and the respondents represented 100 different school districts. The number of surveys received from each of the individual school districts in the state of Georgia were listed in Appendix I.

The researcher mailed surveys to 500 individuals completing their second year of teaching during the 2000-2001 school year. There were 327 surveys returned to the researcher for an overall return rate of 65.4%. What was noteworthy about the new teacher demographic data was that the teachers were, much like the regular teaching force, overwhelmingly female 276 (84.4%). In addition, the majority of the teachers possessed bachelor's degrees 293 (89.6%), were Caucasian 272 (83.2%), were certified 316 (96.6%), and graduated from a teacher education program 315 (96.3%).

Research Questions, Findings, and Data Analysis

Using the SPSS Graduate Package 8.0 for Windows, data were analyzed in support of the following research questions:

Research Question 1: What were the needs of assistance as perceived by new teachers in the state of Georgia?

The new teachers' needs of assistance were rank-ordered as shown in Table IV. Survey items 29-54 were designed to identify the needs. To determine the needs of

Table IV

Rank Order of Needs of Assistance for Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers

Item	Description	Mean*	SD
35	Obtaining materials and supplies	2.56	1.08
37	Preparation time	2.43	1.16
42	Determining learning levels of students	2.38	.92
36	Dealing with individual student's problems	2.38	.93
29	Classroom discipline	2.37	1.04
54	Using technology as an instructional tool	2.32	1.11
40	Effective use of different teaching methods or strategies	2.32	.92
53	Using technology as a teaching resource	2.31	1.08
46	Obtaining adequate school equipment	2.28	1.01
33	Relating with parents	2.25	.97
51	Obtaining guidance and support	2.24	.98
47	Working with diverse learners	2.23	.95
52	Using technology as a management tool	2.22	1.07
41	Awareness of school policies and rules	2.22	1.02
44	Clerical work	2.21	1.06
39	Planning lessons and class activities	2.20	1.00
34	Organizing classwork (content)	2.18	1.08

Table IV (continued)

Item	Description	Mean*	SD
31	Dealing with individual differences	2.12	.98
30	Motivating students	2.06	.96
50	Efficient use of time	2.05	.99
32	Assessing students' work	2.00	.97
49	Using textbooks/curriculum guides	1.97	1.00
48	Working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds	1.82	.93
45	Relating with principals/administrators	1.81	.98
43	Knowledge of subject matter	1.79	.95
38	Relating with other teachers	1.64	.87

Note. N = 327.

*Based on the following scale: 4 = very strong need, 3 = strong need, 2 = moderate need, and 1 = no need.

assistance as perceived by new teachers, the data were gathered on Likert-type scales ranging from 4 to 1. The opinions relating to the needs of assistance were grouped with responses of 4 = very strong need, 3 = strong need, 2 = moderate need, and 1 = no need. A mean score was calculated for each needs scale item. These mean scores were then rank ordered for analysis.

Items 29-51 reflected Veenman's (1984) study identifying problems of new teachers. Each of these items was identified by Veenman as the biggest obstacles of new teachers which may account for several items reflecting similar mean scores. Questions 52-54 in this section were added by the researcher to reflect the new teacher's use of technology in the classroom.

Scores ranged from a high on question 35 dealing with obtaining materials and supplies with a mean of 2.56 (SD = 1.08) to a low on question 38 regarding relating with other teachers with a mean of 1.64 (SD = .87). This difference indicated that while new teachers perceived they needed assistance with obtaining materials and supplies, they needed less assistance relating with other teachers. Since there was no mean score of 3.0 or higher, out of a 4-point scale, no item could be considered as having a "very strong need." The highest mean score of 2.56 (SD = 1.08) was Item 35, reflecting a concern with obtaining materials and supplies, meaning there was a "strong need for assistance" in this area. Item 37, preparation time, was identified as the item with the next greatest need for assistance with a mean score of 2.43 (SD = 1.16). This mean would also be categorized in the "strong need" category along with eighteen other survey items having mean scores ranging between 2.05 and 2.38: Item 42: determining learning levels of students with a mean of 2.38 (SD = .92); Item 36: dealing with individual student's problems with a mean of 2.38 (SD = .93); Item 29: classroom discipline with a mean of 2.37 (SD = 1.04); Item 54: using technology as an instructional tool with a mean of 2.32 (SD = 1.11); Item 40: effective use of different teaching methods or strategies with a mean of 2.32 (SD = .92); Item 53: using technology as a teaching resource with a mean

of 2.31 (SD = 1.08); Item 46: obtaining adequate school equipment with a mean of 2.28 (SD = 1.01); Item 33: relating with parents with a mean of 2.25 (SD = .97); Item 51: obtaining guidance and support with a mean of 2.24 (SD = .98); Item 47: working with diverse learners with a mean of 2.23 (SD = .95); Item 52: using technology as a management tool with a mean of 2.22 (SD = 1.07); Item 41: awareness of school policies and rules with a mean of 2.22 (SD = 1.02); Item 44: clerical work with a mean of 2.21 (SD = 1.06); Item 39: planning lessons and class activities with a mean of 2.20 (SD = 1.00); Item 34: organizing classwork (content) with a mean of 2.18 (SD = 1.08); Item 31: dealing with individual differences with a mean of 2.12 (SD = .98); Item 30: motivating students with a mean of 2.06 (SD = .96); and Item 50: efficient use of time with a mean of 2.05 (SD = .99). New teachers indicated that each of these items was strongly needed during their first year.

The remaining six items ranged from 1.64 to 2.00 out of a possible 4-point scale and were classified in the "moderate need" category. These items included: Item 32: assessing students' work with a mean of 2.00 (SD = .97); Item 49: using textbooks/curriculum guides with a mean of 1.97 (SD = 1.00); Item 48: working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds with a mean of 1.82 (SD = .93); Item 45: relating with principals/administrators with a mean of 1.81 (SD = .98); Item 43: knowledge of subject matter with a mean of 1.79 (SD = .95); and Item 38: relating with other teachers with a mean of 1.64 (SD = .87). The need for assistance on each of these items was interpreted as new teachers perceiving a "moderate need for assistance" in each of these areas.

There were no questions with means in the 0.000 to 0.999 range indicating that no teachers identified themselves as having "no need for assistance" in any of the survey areas. This score can be interpreted to mean the teachers surveyed did need some assistance in all of the survey areas.

The total responses to all questions for each participant were summarized with composite scores of 56.36. The grand mean for all responses to all twenty-six questions concerning the new teacher's need for assistance was in the range of "moderate need of assistance" with a mean of 2.17.

Research Question 2: What assistance was provided to new teachers in school districts across the state of Georgia to induct new teachers in the following areas: (a) socialization into the school environment and culture, (b) special consideration in assignments, and (c) professional needs?

Questionnaire items 5, 6, 8, 10-13, and 15 addressed the new teacher's socialization into the school environment and culture (research question 2a). Questionnaire items 17-22 reflected the issue of special consideration in assignments (research question 2b). Finally, questionnaire items 7, 9, 14, 16, 23-28 addressed the new teacher's professional needs (research question 2c). Tables V-IX reflect the frequencies and percentages calculated from the responses to these questionnaire items.

Socialization Into the School Environment and Culture

New teachers' data reflecting their socialization into the school environment and culture was found in Table V. Of the respondents, 289 (88.4%) were involved in new teacher orientations at the system level. However, only 219 (67%) participated in orientations at the building level. Three (.9%) respondents indicated they were hired during the week of pre-planning, 5 (1.5%) teachers indicated they started teaching after pre-planning, and 6 (1.8%) responded they were hired in the middle of the school year. Each of these respondents expressed concern through the survey regarding the importance of developing a plan for assisting new teachers hired after the beginning of pre-planning with the induction process.

Many participants who answered "yes" to items 5 and 6 also answered Questions 5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b, regarding the number and length of orientation sessions. Data depicting the number of orientation sessions at the district (system) and school (building)

Table V

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Socialization Into the School Environment and Culture

Item	Description	Yes		No		Not Needed	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
5	System level orientation	289	88.4	38	11.5		
6	School building orientation	219	67.0	103	31.4		
8	Mentor assigned	280	85.6	47	14.4		
10	Guided tour of school given	209	63.9	115	35.2	2	.6
11	Introduced to support personnel in school	205	62.7	115	35.2	6	1.8
12	Offered assistance in securing housing	7	2.1	53	16.2	266	81.3
13	Provided information about community	96	29.4	190	58.1	41	12.5
15	Clearly articulated norms or expectations	243	74.3	83	25.4		

Note. N = 327.

Table VI

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Orientation Sessions (Number)

Type	# of sessions	N	%
District (System)	1	100	30.6
	2	74	22.6
	3	31	9.5
	4	18	5.5
	5	38	11.6
	6	4	1.2
	7	1	.3
	8	4	1.2
	9	3	.9
	10	3	.9
	11	3	.9
	12	1	.3
School (Building)	1	129	39.4
	2	25	7.6
	3	21	6.4
	4	3	.9
	5	11	3.4
	6	4	1.2
	8	5	1.5
	9	3	.9
	10	2	.6
	12	1	.3

Note. N = 327.

Table VII

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Orientation Sessions (Length)

Type	# of hours	N	%
District (System)	1	42	12.8
	2	46	14.1
	3	19	5.8
	4	20	6.1
	5	10	3.1
	6	12	3.7
	7	13	4
	8	112	34.3
School (Building)	.5	6	1.8
	1	129	39.4
	1.5	1	.3
	2	25	7.6
	2.5	1	.3
	3	12	3.7
	3.5	1	.3
	4	30	9.2
	5	6	1.8
	6	6	1.8
	7	3	.9
	8	31	9.5

Note. N = 327.

Table VIII

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Special Consideration in Assignments

Item	Description	Yes		No		Do Not Know	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
17	Student assignment	83	25.4	168	51.4	73	22.3
18	Reduced workload	17	5.2	290	88.7	19	5.8
19	Reduced class sizes	12	3.7	301	92.0	13	4.0
20	Reduced nonteaching duties and responsibilities	48	14.7	266	81.3	12	3.7
21	Assigned teaching area matched training	296	90.5	30	9.2		
22	Assigned classroom opposed to "floating"	283	86.5	42	12.8		

Note. N = 327.

Table IX

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Professional Needs

Item	Description	Yes		No	
		N	%	N	%
7	New teacher handbook provided	182	55.7	143	43.7
9	Formal mentoring program in system	224	68.5	97	29.7
14	Scheduled meetings with principal	124	37.9	202	61.8
16	Provided textbooks, curriculum guides, etc., prior to pre-planning week	180	55.0	143	43.7
23	Opportunity to observe experienced teacher	185	56.6	141	43.1
24	Opportunity to attend inservice/staff development for new teachers	199	60.9	125	38.2
25	Opportunity for an experienced teacher to observe beginning teacher	167	51.1	159	48.6
26	Principal observed other than mandated assessments	169	51.7	156	47.7
27	Provided adequate information about evaluation process	295	90.2	31	9.5
28	Provided adequate feedback about performance	299	91.4	27	8.3

Note. N = 327.

level were depicted in Table VI. Data indicating the length of each orientation session at the district and school level were depicted in Table VII. The number of system orientation sessions reported by the respondents ranged from 1 to 12. There were 100 (30.6%) respondents indicating one as the number of system sessions they attended. There were 46 teachers attending a system session that lasted 2 hours. There were 12.8% (42) of teachers who experienced a system session which lasted only 1 hour.

At the school level, responses regarding the number of orientation sessions also ranged from 1 to a high of 12. Of these school sessions, the majority reported, 39.4% (129) occurred only one time. The next highest percentage was two school level sessions reported by 25 (7.6%) teachers. Again, each of the sessions varied in length from a low of 1/2 hour to a high of 8 hours per session. There were 73 (22.3%) individuals who indicated the length of the school orientation to be an hour and 9.5% (31) reported the school session as lasting 2 hours. There were 12 (3.7%) individuals participating in a school orientation lasting 3 hours. There were a total of 9.2% (30) of teachers reporting a 4 hour session and 9.5% (31) teachers reporting an 8 hour session. There were 31.4% (103) of participants who reported having no school level orientation to familiarize them with school policies and procedures.

A mentor who could share information with the new teacher was assigned to 85.6% (280) of the new teachers. However, 14.4% (47) individuals reported having no mentor assigned to assist them with their transition into the profession. Additionally, many of the teachers, although they were assigned a mentor, indicated that they never met with the mentor for instructional planning.

Only 63.9% (209) of the new teachers were provided a guided tour of the school within which they were employed. There were 35.2% (115) teachers who were left to locate materials and places in his or her school building on their own. Introductions to support personnel within the school were only provided to 62.7% (205) of new teachers. This left 35.2% (115) of the new teachers to introduce themselves.

Only 2.1% (7) teachers were provided with assistance in the area of locating housing. A total of 16.2% (53) responded they were not provided with assistance in this area. However, the majority, 81.3% (266) reported they did not need assistance with securing housing. Many of the respondents made notations on the questionnaire indicating they grew up in the geographical area of their school or completed student teaching in that school or district. This familiarity would account for their lack of need for assistance in this area.

Information about the community in which the teacher was employed was provided to only 29.4% (96) of the teachers with 58.1% (190) reporting they were not provided with this critical information. Again, 12.5% (41) of the participating teachers reported not needing this information.

However, new teachers reported that most administrators did clearly communicate their expectations of the new teachers during the recruitment and hiring process. Norms were evident to new teachers in 74.3% (243) of the respondents. There were, however, 25.4% (83) individuals indicating that the norms or expectations of the school and/or district were not evident during recruitment and/or employment.

Special Consideration in Assignments Made to New Teachers

Data relating to part 2 of Research Question 2, special consideration in assignments, are shown in Table VIII. Items 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 addressed special considerations. Only 25.4% (83) of the teachers indicated special considerations was given to the types of students assigned to them (i.e., known discipline problems, special needs students, etc.). Of the respondents, 22.3% (73) indicated they did not know if any special considerations were given for student assignments. More than one half, 51.4% (168) reported no special consideration was given to the kinds of students placed in their classroom.

Only 17 (5.2%) teachers reported they were provided with reduced work loads through fewer classes as compared to experienced colleagues. The majority, 88.7% (290) of teachers reported they were not provided any reduction and 19 (5.8%) indicated they did not know if they had fewer classes than other experienced teachers within the school.

The majority of new teachers, 92% (301) were not provided with reduced class sizes as compared to experienced teachers in their school. Only 3.7% (12) of new teachers reported a reduction in their class sizes and 4% (13) indicated they were unsure. Most new teachers, 81.3% (266) reported they were given no reduction in nonteaching duties and responsibilities as compared to the experienced teachers, while 3.7% (12) indicated they did not know. Only 14.7% (48) teachers indicated they believed they did receive fewer nonteaching duties and responsibilities when compared to veteran teachers.

Regarding assignment to teaching area and classroom, very positive responses were found. Most teachers, 90.5% (296), reported they were assigned a teaching area which matched their background and training. Only 9.2% (30) indicated they were not employed in an area which appropriately reflected and matched their training. Of the new teachers, 86.5% (283) were assigned to a classroom as opposed to "floating" between classrooms. Of the 12.8% (42) who reported not being assigned to a classroom, several indicated they were employed as art, music, or offered augmented services such as SIA or Title I teachers.

Professional Needs Assistance

Data relating to part 3 of Research Question 2 describing professional needs assistance, were shown in Table IX. As identified in the table, questionnaire items 7, 9, 14,16, and 23-28 addressed the new teacher's professional needs.

A handbook designed specifically for new teachers was provided to only 55.7% (182) of the new teachers, leaving 43.7% (143) of participating Georgia's new teachers with no handbook guiding them into the profession. New teachers reported that only 68.5% (224) had a formal mentor program in place within their district. There were

29.7% (97) teachers who indicated no formal mentor program in their school district during the 1999-2000 school year.

Only 37.9% (124) of principals who hired these new teachers scheduled meetings with them during the first few weeks of school. This means 61.8% (202), or the majority of Georgia's new teachers, did not have the opportunity to formally meet with administrators during the critical first few weeks of school.

Appropriate curricula (textbooks, curriculum guides, etc.) were provided to 55% (180) of the new teachers prior to pre-planning week enabling these teachers to begin the academic planning process early and without the interference of meetings during the busy week before school begins. However, 43.7% (143) teachers were expected to review textbooks and curriculum guides and plan appropriate lessons during the busy week of pre-planning.

Only 56.6% (185) of the new teachers reported having the opportunity to observe an experienced teacher, and even fewer, 51.1% (167), identified another teacher as having the opportunity to observe them and provide feedback. The opportunity to attend inservice/staff development designed specifically for new teachers was provided to only 60.9% (199) of the participants. Of these, 11.9% (39) attended two sessions, 10.1% (33) attended one session, 5.2% (17) attended three sessions, and 5.8% (19) attended four staff development sessions. The most sessions attended by a respondent was 12 (.3%). The teachers reported that 51.7% (169), or slightly over half, of the principals observed him or her (other than to meet mandated county requirements) during the first year.

Positive data, however, were found regarding the new teacher evaluation process across the state of Georgia. The majority, 90.2% (295), of the teachers reported being provided with adequate information about the evaluation process, and 91.4% (299) reported being provided with adequate feedback about his or her performance during the observation.

Questions 55 and 56 asked participants to identify the number of times their mentors met with them for instructional planning during the first month of teaching (Question 55) and after the first month of teaching (Question 56). There was incredible variation in the amount of support provided or not provided by mentors across the state. The answers ranged from a low of zero to a high of meeting two or more times a week (after the first month of school). One individual even indicated she met with her mentor daily because they were team teachers. Data reflecting the mentor questions were shown in Table X.

During the first month of teaching, 62% (203) teachers met with their mentor 2 or more times, 11.3% (37) reported meeting with their mentor only once, and 26% (85) reported meeting zero times with their mentor during the first month. Another concern regarding the data were the high number of teachers in the state of Georgia who reported being assigned a mentor but meeting with that mentor zero times during the school year. There were 19.9% (65) teachers who reported never meeting with their mentor (after the first month of teaching). One teacher indicated that she only met with her mentor when the mentor needed a signature.

After the first month of teaching, new teachers reported that the majority of mentors met with their mentees less than once a month, 36.7% (120). There were 19.6% (64) who reported their mentors met with them once a month, while 10.4% (34) indicated meeting with their mentor twice a month. There were 17.4% (57) reporting meeting with their mentor once a week and 15% (49) noting spending time with their mentor in instructional planning two or more times a week.

Research Question 3: What were the perceptions of new teachers about the adequacy of existing induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia? Questionnaire items 29 - 54 addressed Research Question 3. Twenty-three of these items (items 29 - 51) were identified by Veenman (1984) as the top problems of new teachers. Questions 52-54 were added by the researcher to reflect the teacher's use of technology in

Table X

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Responses Regarding Mentor Relationships

Item	Description	# times met with mentor	N	%
55	Number of times new teacher met with mentor for instructional planning	0	85	26
		1	37	11.3
		2	43	13.1
		3	32	9.8
		4 or more times	128	39.1
56	Number of times new teacher met with mentor for instructional planning after the first month	zero	65	19.9
		when he/she needed a signature	1	.3
		one time	3	.9
		two times	1	.3
		one time every other month	3	.9
		once each nine weeks	5	1.5
		once every six weeks	3	.9
		less than once a month	120	36.7
		once a month	64	19.6
		twice a month	34	10.4
		once a week	57	17.4
		two or more times a week	49	15
		at least once a day	1	.3

Note. N = 327.

the classroom during his or her first year of teaching. The data was gathered on a Likert-type scale. The opinions relating to the adequacy of assistance provided were grouped with responses of 4 = very adequate, 3 = adequate, 2 = somewhat adequate, 1 = inadequate, and 0 = not provided. The respondents who had not received assistance on an item indicated so in the "not provided" column. It is significant to note that respondents who had not received assistance on an item were included in the mean scores reported. Table XI identifies a rank ordered mean score for each assistance scale item.

The data reflecting this question were overwhelmingly positive indicating that Georgia's new teachers perceive they are receiving adequate assistance with these aspects of the induction process. Only one item reflected a mean score of 3.5 or above out of a possible 4-point scale. This was Item 38, relating with other teachers with a mean score of 3.56 (SD = 1.29). This means new teachers in the state of Georgia perceive their adequacy of assistance in this area to be more than "adequate."

All of the other items' means were identified with scores of 3.02 - 3.49 out of a possible 4-point scale. Again, these scores indicate that Georgia's new teachers perceive the assistance they are receiving in each of these areas to be acceptable. The close proximity of scores indicates that the new teachers perceived assistance fairly positively across the state. These items included: Item 43, knowledge of subject matter with a mean score of 3.49 (SD = 1.18). Item 45: relating with principals/administrators with a mean of 3.44 (SD = 1.16); Item 49: using textbooks/curriculum guides with a mean of 3.33 (SD = 1.23); Item 34: organizing classwork (content) with a mean of 3.32 (SD = 1.27); Item 44: clerical work with a mean of 3.32 (SD = 1.32); Item 32: assessing students' work with a mean of 3.31 (SD = 1.25); Item 48: working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds with a mean of 3.29 (SD = 1.28); Item 41: awareness of school policies and rules with a mean of 3.23 (SD = 1.05); Item 31: dealing with individual differences with a mean of 3.22 (SD = 1.25); Item 51: obtaining guidance

Table XI

Rank Order of Adequacy of Assistance for Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers

Item	Description	Mean*	SD
38	Relating with other teachers	3.56	1.29
43	Knowledge of subject matter	3.49	1.18
45	Relating with principals/administrators	3.44	1.16
49	Using textbooks/curriculum guides	3.33	1.23
34	Organizing classwork (content)	3.32	1.27
44	Clerical work	3.32	1.32
32	Assessing students' work	3.31	1.25
48	Working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds	3.29	1.28
41	Awareness of school policies and rules	3.23	1.05
31	Dealing with individual differences	3.22	1.25
51	Obtaining guidance and support	3.21	1.04
33	Relating with parents	3.19	1.23
54	Using technology as an instructional tool	3.19	1.27
50	Efficient use of time	3.18	1.27
39	Planning lessons and class activities	3.17	1.22
53	Using technology as a teaching resource	3.17	1.26
40	Effective use of different teaching methods or strategies	3.16	1.17

Table XI (continued)

Item	Description	Mean*	SD
30	Motivating students	3.14	1.26
35	Obtaining materials and supplies	3.13	1.15
52	Using technology as a management tool	3.12	1.27
47	Working with diverse learners	3.10	1.19
46	Obtaining adequate school equipment	3.08	1.18
29	Classroom discipline	3.05	1.16
42	Determining learning levels of students	3.03	1.17
36	Dealing with individual students' problems	3.03	1.08
37	Preparation time	3.02	1.33

Note. N = 327.

*Based on the following scale: 4 = very adequate, 3 = adequate, 2 = somewhat adequate, 1 = inadequate, and 0 = not provided.

and support with a mean of 3.21 (SD = 1.04); Item 33: relating with parents with a mean of 3.19 (SD = 1.23); Item 54: using technology as an instructional tool with a mean of 3.19 (SD = 1.27); Item 50: efficient use of time with a mean of 3.18 (SD = 1.27); Item 39: planning lessons and class activities with a mean of 3.17 (SD = 1.22); Item 53: using technology as a teaching resource with a mean of 3.17 (SD = 1.26); Item 40: effective use of different methods or strategies with a mean of 3.16 (SD = 1.17); Item 30: motivating students with a mean of 3.14 (SD = 1.26); Item 35: obtaining materials and supplies with a mean of 3.13 (SD = 1.15); Item 52: using technology as a management tool with a mean of 3.12 (SD = 1.27); Item 47: working with diverse learners with a mean of 3.10 (SD = 1.19); Item 46: obtaining adequate school equipment with a mean of 3.08 (SD = 1.18); Item 29: classroom discipline with a mean of 3.05 (SD = 1.16); Item 42: determining learning levels of students with a mean of 3.03 (SD = 1.17); Item 36: dealing with individual student's problems with a mean of 3.03 (SD = 1.08); and Item 37: preparation time with a mean of 3.02 (SD = 1.33).

None of the scores ranged between 2.000 and 2.999, out of a possible 4-point scale, indicating that none of the assistance in these areas was perceived to be only "adequate." In addition, none of the scores were at 1.999 or below out of a possible 4-point scale, indicating that none of the assistance in these areas was perceived to be "somewhat adequate." There were also no items whose means fell into the "inadequate" category. Again, the responses reflecting the area of adequacy of assistance were overwhelmingly positive indicating new teachers in the state of Georgia perceive their needs as being met.

The total responses to all questions for each participant were summarized with composite scores of 83.48. The grand mean for all responses to all 26 questions concerning the new teacher's adequacy of assistance was 3.21 out of a possible 4-point scale.

There were a number of teachers who reported they were "not provided" with the support identified on the survey items by indicating "0" on the survey (Table XII). There were 38 (11.6%) teachers indicating they were "not provided" with support in the area of classroom discipline. There were 63 (19.3%) teachers reporting they were "not provided" with assistance in motivating students. Sixty-six (20.2%) teachers identified themselves as "not being provided" with help dealing with individual student differences, while 70 (21.4%) indicated they were not assisted in the area of assessing students' work. There were 60 (18.3%) teachers who indicated they were not assisted in the area of dealing with parents. Regarding organizing classwork (content), there were 73 (22.3%) teachers who were "not provided" assistance in this area. Assistance in obtaining materials and supplies was "not provided" to 33 (10.1%) of the new teachers surveyed and 29 (8.9%) were "not provided" with assistance in dealing with individual student's problems. Assistance in securing preparation time was "not provided" to 58 (17.7%) of the teachers and assistance with relating to other teachers was "not provided" to 76 (23.2%) of the novices. Fifty-two (15.9%) teachers indicated they were "not provided" with assistance in planning lessons and class activities and 51 (15.6%) were "not provided" with assistance regarding the effective use of different teaching methods or strategies. Assistance in the area of awareness of school policies and rules was "not provided" to 26 (8%) of the new teachers. There were 43 (13.1%) of the participating teachers indicating they were "not provided" assistance determining learning levels of students and 75 (22.9%) teachers reporting they were "not provided" help refining their knowledge of subject matter. Seventy-four (22.6%) teachers were "not provided" clerical help and 65 (19.9%) identified themselves as "not being provided" help with relating to administrators. Thirty- two (9.8%) teachers were not assisted in obtaining adequate school equipment and 49 (15%) were "not provided" with help working with diverse learners. Regarding working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, there were 70 (21.4%) teachers "not provided" help in this area and 69 (21.1%) teachers "not provided" guidance in using textbooks and

Table XII

Georgia's 1999-2000 New Teachers' Identification of Support "Not Provided"

Item	Description	f	%
29	Classroom discipline	38	11.6
30	Motivating students	63	19.3
31	Dealing with individual differences	66	20.2
32	Assessing students' work	70	21.4
33	Relating with parents	60	18.3
34	Organizing classwork (content)	73	22.3
35	Obtaining materials and supplies	33	10.1
36	Dealing with individual student's problems	29	8.9
37	Preparation time	58	17.7
38	Relating with other teachers	76	23.2
39	Planning lessons and class activities	52	15.9
40	Effective use of different teaching methods or strategies	51	15.6
41	Awareness of school policies and rules	26	8
42	Determining learning levels of students	43	13.1
43	Knowledge of subject matter	75	22.9
44	Clerical work	74	22.6

Table XII (continued)

Item	Description	f	%
45	Relating with principals/ administrators	65	19.9
46	Obtaining adequate school equipment	32	9.8
47	Working with diverse learners	49	15
48	Working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds	70	21.4
49	Using textbooks/curriculum guides	69	21.1
50	Efficient use of time	60	18.3
51	Obtaining guidance and support	31	9.5
52	Using technology as a management tool	51	15.6
53	Using technology as a teaching resource	52	15.9
54	Using technology as an instructional tool	54	16.5

Note. N = 327.

curriculum guides. Assistance in the area of time management (efficient use of time) failed to be offered to 60 (18.3%) of the beginners and 31 (9.5%) were not offered assistance obtaining guidance and support.

In the area of technology, information regarding using technology as a management tool was "not provided" to 51 (15.6%) of the novices. Additionally, 52 (15.9%) of the teachers identified themselves as "not being provided" with information on how to use technology as a teaching tool and 54 (16.5%) were "not provided" data regarding methods of using technology as an instructional tool.

Research Question 4: What differences, if any, existed in the needs of the teachers among the categories of the following variables: (a) college-degree level, (b) institution from which the participant graduated, and (c) grade level of teaching position?

Demographic information provided by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission was utilized to identify each participants' college-degree level and to answer research Question 4a. Questionnaire items 3 and 4 were used to answer research question 4b. Item 1 was utilized to answer Question 4b. The "no need" responses were eliminated, and a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the data, using SPSS Graduate Package 8.0 for Windows, to determine if significant differences existed among the categories of variables of college-degree level (Table XIII), institution from which the participant graduated (Table XIV), and grade level of teaching position (Table XV).

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the data, using SPSS Graduate Package 8.0 for Windows, to determine the difference in the needs of new teachers (Survey items 29 - 54) among college-degree levels. The results are displayed in Table XIII. Since $p < .05$ was established, the difference in the new teachers' needs among the degree levels was not significant at the .05 level. The analysis of variance indicated no significant relationship between the college-degree level and the needs of new teachers $F(1, 208) = .725$, $p = .494$. Data are displayed in Table XIII.

Table XIII

Analysis of Variance for the Differences in the Needs of Georgia's New Teachers (survey questions 29 - 54) Among College-Degree Level

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 29				
Between	.451	1	.451	.680
Among	158.330	239	.662	
Total	158.780	240		
Item 30				
Between	.355	1	.355	.660
Among	111.368	207	.538	
Total	111.722	208		
Item 31				
Between	.003	1	.003	.006
Among	105.621	208	.508	
Total	105.624	209		
Item 32				
Between	.273	1	.273	.501
Among	104.737	192	.546	
Total	105.010	193		
Item 33				
Between	.437	1	.437	.813
Among	123.662	230	.538	
Total	124.099	231		
Item 34				
Between	.824	1	.824	1.301
Among	127.936	202	.633	
Total	128.760	203		

* $p < .05$

Note. The degrees of freedom reflect the two degree levels which were represented by the sample (bachelors and masters). There were no other degree levels indicated by participants.

Table XIII (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 35				
Between	.603	1	.603	.896
Among	164.198	244	.673	
Total	164.801	245		
Item 36				
Between	1.133	1	1.133	1.966
Among	147.472	256	.576	
Total	148.605	257		
Item 37				
Between	.557	1	.557	.771
Among	157.425	218	.722	
Total	157.982	219		
Item 38				
Between	1.150	1	1.150	2.400
Among	61.342	128	.479	
Total	62.492	129		
Item 39				
Between	.112	1	.112	.200
Among	120.579	215	.561	
Total	120.691	216		
Item 40				
Between	.117	1	.117	.232
Among	123.513	244	.506	
Total	123.630	245		
Item 41				
Between	.280	1	.280	.457
Among	132.825	217	.612	
Total	133.105	218		

Table XIII (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 42				
Between	.163	1	.163	.312
Among	130.072	250	.520	
Total	130.234	251		
Item 43				
Between	1.527	1	1.527	2.637
Among	88.037	152	.579	
Total	89.565	153		
Item 44				
Between	.491	1	.491	.759
Among	135.717	210	.646	
Total	136.208	211		
Item 45				
Between	1.087	1	1.087	2.033
Among	79.186	148	.535	
Total	80.273	149		
Item 46				
Between	.281	1	.281	.460
Among	137.930	226	.610	
Total	138.211	227		
Item 47				
Between	.062	1	.062	.123
Among	116.955	230	.508	
Total	117.017	231		
Item 48				
Between	.010	1	.010	.018
Among	89.966	166	.542	
Total	89.976	167		

Table XIII (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 49				
Between	.085	1	.085	.018
Among	89.966	166	.542	
Total	89.976	167		
Item 50				
Between	.046	1	.046	.085
Among	104.362	194	.538	
Total	104.408	195		
Item 51				
Between	.084	1	.084	.155
Among	124.670	230	.542	
Total	124.754	231		
Item 52				
Between	.027	1	.027	.041
Among	137.691	211	.653	
Total	137.718	212		
Item 53				
Between	.304	1	.304	.470
Among	142.489	220	.648	
Total	142.793	221		
Item 54				
Between	.582	1	.582	.862
Among	145.991	216	.676	
Total	146.573	217		

Table XIV

Analysis of Variance for the Differences in the Needs of Georgia's New Teachers (survey questions 29 - 54) Among Institution from Which the Participant Graduated

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 29				
Between	16.598	35	.474	.700
Among	136.170	201	.677	
Total	152.768	236		
Item 30				
Between	15.825	35	.452	.806
Among	94.780	169	.561	
Total	110.605	204		
Item 31				
Between	17.777	35	.508	1.022
Among	83.999	169	.497	
Total	101.776	204		
Item 32				
Between	19.841	35	.567	1.099
Among	80.998	157	.516	
Total	100.839	192		
Item 33				
Between	17.473	35	.499	.884
Among	110.086	195	.565	
Total	127.558	230		
Item 34				
Between	24.941	35	.713	1.161
Among	101.910	166	.614	
Total	126.851	201		

* $p < .05$

Table XIV (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 35				
Between	17.461	35	.499	.709
Among	146.392	208	.704	
Total	163.852	243		
Item 36				
Between	12.878	35	.368	.597
Among	135.059	219	.617	
Total	147.937	254		
Item 37				
Between	16.586	35	.474	.617
Among	141.414	184	.769	
Total	158.000	219		
Item 38				
Between	13.190	35	.377	.711
Among	48.739	92	.530	
Total	61.930	127		
Item 39				
Between	19.822	35	.566	1.020
Among	100.492	181	.555	
Total	120.313	216		
Item 40				
Between	16.546	35	.473	.939
Among	105.266	209	.504	
Total	121.812	244		
Item 41				
Between	15.411	35	.440	.699
Among	113.999	181	.630	
Total	129.410	216		

Table XIV (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 42				
Between	16.879	35	.482	.932
Among	110.785	214	.518	
Total	127.664	249		
Item 43				
Between	14.748	35	.421	.679
Among	72.638	117	.621	
Total	87.386	152		
Item 44				
Between	21.144	35	.604	.917
Among	113.918	173	.658	
Total	135.062	208		
Item 45				
Between	13.331	35	.381	.635
Among	68.329	114	.599	
Total	81.660	149		
Item 46				
Between	19.005	35	.543	.879
Among	118.587	192	.618	
Total	137.592	227		
Item 47				
Between	15.402	35	.440	.862
Among	99.072	194	.511	
Total	114.474	229		
Item 48				
Between	17.744	35	.507	.949
Among	70.004	131	.534	
Total	87.749	166		

Table XIV (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 49				
Between	12.847	35	.367	.597
Among	87.248	142	.614	
Total	100.096	177		
Item 50				
Between	13.162	35	.376	.657
Among	90.385	158	.572	
Total	103.546	193		
Item 51				
Between	16.595	35	.474	.853
Among	106.668	192	.556	
Total	123.263	227		
Item 52				
Between	21.637	35	.618	.923
Among	115.922	173	.670	
Total	137.560	208		
Item 53				
Between	26.687	35	.762	1.196
Among	116.010	182	.637	
Total	142.697	217		
Item 54				
Between	26.174	35	.748	1.106
Among	120.354	178	.676	
Total	146.528	213		

Table XV

Analysis of Variance for the Differences in the Needs of Georgia's New Teachers (survey questions 29 - 54) Among Grade Level of Teaching Position

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 29				
Between	2.471	5	.494	.742
Among	161.203	242	.666	
Total	163.673	247		
Item 30				
Between	3.232	5	.646	1.156
Among	117.430	210	.559	
Total	120.662	215		
Item 31				
Between	6.532	5	1.306	2.610*
Among	105.130	210	.501	
Total	111.662	215		
Item 32				
Between	2.162	5	.432	.796
Among	105.997	195	.544	
Total	108.159	200		
Item 33				
Between	1.638	5	.328	.585
Among	130.555	233	.560	
Total	132.192	238		
Item 34				
Between	.713	5	.143	.221
Among	131.668	204	.645	
Total	132.381	209		

* $p < .05$

Table XV (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 35				
Between	4.730	5	.946	1.438
Among	163.128	248	.658	
Total	167.858	253		
Item 36				
Between	5.107	5	1.021	1.781
Among	149.074	260	.573	
Total	154.180	265		
Item 37				
Between	2.367	5	.473	.655
Among	160.593	222	.723	
Total	162.961	227		
Item 38				
Between	3.248	5	.650	1.385
Among	60.500	129	.469	
Total	63.748	134		
Item 39				
Between	2.116	5	.423	.749
Among	123.724	219	.565	
Total	125.840	224		
Item 40				
Between	4.641	5	.928	1.883
Among	122.241	248	.493	
Total	126.882	253		
Item 41				
Between	6.987	5	1.397	2.374*
Among	130.079	221	.589	
Total	137.066	226		

* $p < .05$

Table XV (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 42				
Between	.729	5	.146	.278
Among	133.037	254	.524	
Total	133.765	259		
Item 43				
Between	7.316	5	1.463	2.683*
Among	83.451	153	.545	
Total	90.767	158		
Item 44				
Between	3.064	5	.613	.945
Among	137.468	212	.648	
Total	140.532	217		
Item 45				
Between	1.433	5	.287	.523
Among	82.176	150	.548	
Total	83.609	155		
Item 46				
Between	2.753	5	.551	.898
Among	140.959	230	.613	
Total	143.712	235		
Item 47				
Between	3.407	5	.681	1.338
Among	119.193	234	.509	
Total	122.600	239		
Item 48				
Between	2.703	5	.541	.995
Among	90.204	166	.543	
Total	92.907	171		

* $p < .05$

Table XV (continued)

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Item 49				
Between	3.785	5	.757	1.358
Among	99.761	179	.557	
Total	103.546	184		
Item 50				
Between	2.317	5	.463	.864
Among	105.114	196	.536	
Total	107.431	201		
Item 51				
Between	1.258	5	.252	.459
Among	125.440	229	.548	
Total	126.698	234		
Item 52				
Between	4.205	5	.841	1.302
Among	135.628	210	.646	
Total	139.833	215		
Item 53				
Between	5.096	5	1.019	1.589
Among	141.085	220	.641	
Total	146.181	225		
Item 54				
Between	3.908	5	.782	1.156
Among	146.720	217	.676	
Total	150.628	222		

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the data, using SPSS Graduate Package 8.0 for Windows, to determine the difference in the needs of new teachers (Survey items 29 - 54) among institutions from which each participant graduated. The results are displayed in Table XIV. Neither was there any significant relationship between the needs of new teachers and the institution from which the participant graduated as indicated by the analysis of variance, F (34, 172) = .852, p = .679. The variance in responses was not attributed to the level of college-degree.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the data, using SPSS Graduate Package 8.0 for Windows, to determine the difference in the needs of new teachers (Survey items 29 - 54) and grade level of teaching position. Regarding the grade level analysis, the analysis determined that there was a significant difference at the .05 level in the responses of the participants based on grade level to three survey items: Item 31: dealing with individual differences with an F value of 2.610; Item 41: awareness of school policies and rules with an F value of 2.374; and Item 43: knowledge of subject matter with an F value of 2.683. However, other than those items, there was no significant relationship between the needs of new teachers and the grade level of teaching position as indicated by the analysis of variance, F (3, 211) = 1.183, p = .413. Data were displayed in Table XV.

Research Question 5: What recommendations, if any, did new teachers have for modifying or improving the induction program in the state of Georgia?

Questionnaire item 57 was used to identify participants' perceptions regarding the adequacy of the existing induction program in their district. Of the participants, 101 (30.9%) recommended continuing the program without modification. The majority of respondents, 135 (41.3%) recommended continuing the program with minor modifications, while 63 (19.3%) suggested that the program be continued with major modifications. There were 25 (7.6%) individuals who recommended that the program in their district be replaced with a different type of program. No individuals named an actual

program in #58 as specified in Question 57d. However, all individuals who identified this option did make numerous recommendations regarding how to improve the existing program in his or her school district. Three individuals (.9%) did not answer this question.

Finally, an open-ended qualitative question (item 58) was utilized to obtain recommendations for modifying or improving Georgia's induction program. Interestingly, there were only 91 respondents who chose not to respond to the qualitative component. Of the 236 respondents choosing to respond to this item, the researcher separated these comments into 443 different ideas generating 34 unique categories. Data collected as a result of the survey was coded according to patterns, relationships, contradictions, similarities, and frequencies. Conclusions were determined from the trends that emerged from the data.

Open-ended comments were found to be inconsistent with the quantitative data reporting regarding their need for assistance. It would appear from reading many of the comments (which are primarily negative) that the needs of new teachers are greater than indicated by the quantitative data reported.

The teachers provided rich qualitative information offering numerous suggestions and ideas to strengthen the existing program. At least 10 individuals reflected on the positive experiences they had at the system level. Many described the existing program as informative and effective. On the other hand, at least 15 participants indicated they were not pleased with the system level orientation sessions offered by their school system. Problems cited were inconvenient location, program components were boring and redundant, and unhelpful and inefficient sessions. Many teachers expressed concern reflecting their perception of the meetings being unproductive and focused on the importance of the practicality of the sessions. Several individuals reiterated the importance and need for orientation sessions at the school level. They indicated the school orientation was an integral component that should not be overlooked or neglected.

Many of the participants indicated they needed time in their classrooms to prepare for the arrival of the students.

There were approximately 11 negative open-ended comments received regarding the school level orientation sessions. Several reflected the need for a comprehensive and detailed new teacher handbook specific to each school. Survey respondent #87 suggested "We need a handbook with everything you need to know as a first year teacher (all forms, what you need to do at the beginning and end of the year, etc.)." Survey respondent #48 agreed and specified, "New teachers should have a special handbook detailing procedures and a checklist of what needs to be done." Respondent #27 further suggested, "Mentors and mentees need a handbook about what needs to be covered during the first year." Additionally, respondents indicated the importance of providing detailed information to new teachers regarding textbooks, report cards, purchasing, obtaining supplies and equipment, and all school procedures and policies. The need for grade specific guidance was a repeated theme throughout the open-ended comments.

The issue generating the most open-ended comments was the mentor program. There were 127 responses from respondents received regarding this area. Of these comments, only 17 of them were of a positive nature. Respondent #28 reflected, "I believe that I was fortunate enough to have a phenomenal mentor. I would encourage districts to train mentors who are willing to really support their mentee. That means helping with lessons, listening, answering questions, helping ease frustration by making your mentee feel you care and are available day and night!" Other comments received regarding positive support provided from mentors included informal and formal communication, availability, similar teaching grades or subjects, willingness to provide assistance, and a positive relationship with mentor.

Many respondents argued that the mentor program needs to be more structured and monitored more closely. The characteristic identified as being most important (noted by at least 35 respondents) was the importance of being assigned a mentor who teaches

the same grade level or subject. Respondent #480 reported, "Most of our mentor time was spent with me observing my mentor's class. She teaches science, and I teach P.E. Her techniques and strategies didn't help me at all."

Mentor characteristics identified repeatedly by respondents included availability, enthusiasm for teaching career, helpfulness, and accessibility. It appears that accountability, clarification of roles and responsibilities, time constraints, and scheduling regular meetings with mentors were major concerns of the new teachers. Again, communication and accountability are themes that repeatedly arose. Survey respondent #2 stated, "I did not know I had a mentor assigned to help me. I was not aware of the mentor program until the end of the year when I had to fill out and sign papers that I was involved." Again, the importance of grade specific guidance from a mentor cannot be neglected or overlooked.

Another concern that arose repeatedly was the lack of availability of mentors to assist mentees during their first year. Respondent #332 reported, "A mentor was assigned; however, I only saw her once. I met my mentor teacher during a meeting during pre-planning. That was the only time I ever saw her. There were no other opportunities. She taught at a different school in our county." Respondent #90 said, "My mentor teacher always had other things going on. She wanted to help so she said, but, always had a conflict." Several teachers also reported feeling guilty asking their mentors for assistance.

An additional concern also revolved around the issue of accountability. Participant #459 reported, "Mentoring isn't monitored. Meetings with mentors can easily 'not happen.' " Respondent #22 wrote, "Someone was assigned to be my mentor but did not really do anything for me. She was not certified for the mentoring program. I think my school district should only allow those teachers who are trained in being a mentor to be a mentor to new teachers. I had to go to my mentor. She did not come to me. I learned a lot my first year because I survived. I had to figure out how to do everything myself. I

was told what to do, but I was not told how. My district/school treated me no different (being a first year teacher) from an experienced teacher."

Two individuals identified specific concerns regarding the need for a tour of the school, introduction to support personnel in school, and information about the community in which they were employed. There were 10 comments specifically highlighting the need for a new teacher handbook designed for the new teachers in a school.

There were at least 42 comments received regarding administrators, most of which were negative. Participant #261 reflected, "Last year was very stressful. I was disappointed that my principal never came to me to ask me how I was doing." Respondent #347 also reported concerns regarding his school administrators, "I was hired the last day of pre-planning - so I was 'thrown' into a classroom. Administration did not have time for new teachers - we basically were left to sink or swim." This statement reiterates the importance of administrators being aware of, available and supportive of the unique needs of new teachers. Other concerns addressed the importance of providing positive feedback, clearly communicating procedures and expectations, and demonstrating personal concern for the new teacher. It was also suggested that the principal assign a leader at the school-level that would be responsible for assisting the new teachers throughout their first year. This individual would be responsible for supervising the mentor/mentee relationship and would serve as an additional resource to the new teacher.

Another concern arose regarding the availability of textbooks being provided prior to pre-planning. Teacher #344 reported, "I didn't get many textbooks for the first half of the year - some never." Several teachers agreed that textbooks and curriculum guides need to be provided before pre-planning to enable the teacher to plan for the first few weeks of school.

Quantitative data indicated there were three teachers hired during pre-planning, four hired after pre-planning, and six hired in the middle of the year. All of these respondents indicated his or her concern regarding their experiences regarding a lack of

induction support. Respondent #11 summed up several teacher's feelings saying, "Teachers who are hired after the school year begins should be accounted for and not overlooked." Respondent #363 agreed, "Plans should be established for late hires! I graduated from school on a Friday and started work on the next Tuesday. It was very overwhelming and stressful!"

Several first year teachers believed they were assigned more duties than more experienced teachers in the school. Respondent #28 indicated, "I had more duties than many experienced teachers, and it was harder to back out of them." Another reported (#80) that she was "pushed to get involved with club groups and sport sponsorships."

Fourteen teachers indicated their interest in needing additional opportunities to observe more experienced teachers to strengthen their knowledge of classroom management and curriculum. Respondent #381 pointed out, "Teachers should be allowed more content and curriculum related courses or planning time. Too much time is spent on generic staff development for elementary to high school teachers."

Twenty-two teachers expressed concern regarding discipline and classroom management during their first year. Participant #379 stated, "My first year, I taught all technology students, most seemingly with behavior problems. I was constantly sending them to the office with valid discipline problems and I did not receive help or support from my administration. No wonder so many first-year teachers quit. We are given the worst students without help and are thrown to the wolves! I would have quit last year if I could have." Respondent #80 agreed and described her experience: "Discipline problems were deliberately given to me to deal with because I would be 'fresh' as they call it." Participant #432 responded, "I feel it was a sink or swim situation, and I'm doing the doggy paddle to stay afloat."

Another repeated theme in the open-ended comments was that the clerical needs of new teachers need to be addressed and not assumed. Participant #73 reflected, "Sometimes new teachers need clerical help with documents like filling out report cards.

No one showed me until errors surfaced. There should be sessions to address these matters and not assume everybody knows." Another respondent (#56) reflected, "The new teacher has no concept of the amount of paperwork involved in the teaching profession. Time management was a huge problem. I was staying until 6:00 P.M. many days to stay on top of everything (and we could leave at 3:15)."

There were at least six individuals who indicated they had served as paraprofessionals before becoming certified teachers. All of these teachers agreed that their experience in the schools proved to be a huge asset in surviving their first year. "I had 7 years experience in the system as a teaching assistant. If I had not had this experience, I feel that I would have been very lost. New teachers don't want to appear inadequate. They are not going to ask for help unless really necessary. The help has to be there without having to ask" (#149).

In the open-ended portion, new teachers appeared to comment either very positively or overwhelmingly negatively regarding their first year experience. One new teacher (#111) reflected positively on her first year, "I was very fortunate to be placed in a school that provided exceptional assistance, support, and encouragement. Our system offered numerous opportunities for me to learn and familiarize myself with policies, expectations, and procedures."

Participant # 158 had a more difficult first year experience; "Hold schools accountable. I sat in my classroom and cried for the first three weeks of class because I didn't know what to teach or who to ask. I was finally given a curriculum guide by someone at the county office. I was not mentored at all outside of friendships I formed with other teachers. I seriously considered leaving the profession after last year." Respondent #254 added, "Teachers are thrown into the fire. I believe the school district should mandate a program for the local school to follow."

A final theme realized through the additional comments was that not only do regular classroom teachers need induction but also "special" teachers such as art, music,

P.E., and school counselors need assistance as well. It is important not to overlook the necessity of assisting these important individuals through their first year. Participant #449 wrote, "We need mentors, too!"

Summary

This study was intended to provide critical information to Georgia's educational administrators regarding the effectiveness of existing induction practices and to identify concerns of new teachers. Georgia's new teachers were surveyed to assess their perceptions of the transition of new teachers into the profession by analyzing the assistance provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia and the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers. Surveys were distributed to 500 teachers completing their second year of teaching during the 2000-2001 school year. The 327 surveys returned reflected the teachers' experiences as first year teachers in Georgia during the 1999-2000 school year.

New teachers in the state of Georgia perceived that they were "moderately" to "strongly in need of assistance" with each of the needs of assistance items on the survey with responses to individual items ranging from "moderately" to "strongly in need of assistance." Overall, this study found that induction practices to socialize new teachers in Georgia were weak. Attention should be focused on practices that would assist the novice teacher in adapting to the new job and environment.

Data regarding assignment factors was found to be both positive and negative. The positive findings were that most teachers were assigned to teaching positions reflective of their training and education and were assigned to a classroom rather than "floating" between classrooms. However, the results of this study verified that special considerations are not common in the state of Georgia regarding the types of students assigned to new teachers, reduction in workloads, or reduction in class sizes.

Regarding the professional needs of teachers, again, the data were both positive and negative. Most new teachers were provided adequate information about the

evaluation process, appropriate feedback regarding their performance, and the norms of the school were clearly communicated. However, the majority of new teachers were not provided with curricula in a timely manner, new teacher handbooks, or opportunities to observe others and to be observed.

This study also found there was no significant difference in the needs of teachers among the categories of the variables of (a) college-degree level, (b) institution from which the participant graduated, and (c) grade level of teaching position. The only significant difference was noted in the responses of the participants based on grade level to three survey items: Item 31: dealing with individual differences with an F value of 2.60; Item 41: awareness of school policies and rules with an F value of 2.374; and Item 43: knowledge of subject matter with an F value of 2.683. However, other than those items, there was no significant relationship between the needs of new teachers and college-degree level, institution from which the participant graduated, or grade level of teaching position.

The majority of new teachers in the state of Georgia, 135 (41.3%) recommended continuing the induction program in his or her school district with minor modifications. Open-ended comments were often inconsistent with the quantitative data reported regarding new teachers' need for assistance. Reading many of the comments (which are primarily negative), it would appear that the needs of new teachers are greater than that indicated by the quantitative data reported.

In the open-ended survey portion, new teachers appeared to comment either very positively or decidedly negative regarding their first year experience. The issue generating the most open-ended comments was the mentor program. There were 127 responses from respondents received regarding this area. Of these comments, only 17 of them were of a positive nature. Essential mentor characteristics identified repeatedly by respondents included availability, enthusiasm for teaching career, helpfulness, and accessibility. It appeared that accountability, clarification of roles and responsibilities, time constraints,

and scheduling regular meetings with mentors were major concerns of the new teachers. The characteristic identified as being most important (noted by at least 35 respondents) was the importance of being assigned a mentor who teaches the same subject or a similar grade level. Many respondents in Georgia argued that the mentor program needs to be more structured and monitored more closely.

According to the findings of this study, implementation of the new teacher induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia, was inconsistent and varied widely during the 1999-2000 school year. The results of this study indicated that many teachers were not being provided with important types of support during the first year of teaching in the state of Georgia.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Research Summary

Partly in response to the high statistics regarding the high rate of teacher turnover, compounded by rising student enrollments and the aging teaching force, induction programs have been generated in school districts across the nation to assist new teachers in progressing smoothly into their new careers (Ashburn, 1987; Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996, Southworth, 2000). New teacher induction programs are defined as formal, planned experiences and activities designed and implemented by school districts to facilitate new teachers' transitions from student teacher to competent classroom teacher.

Many of these programs are structured, data-driven, and responsive to the unique needs of new teachers. These programs prove that induction into the teaching force does work. Unfortunately, many other programs may be less helpful in assisting new teachers into their new profession (Halford, 1998; Ryan, Newman, Mager, Applegate, Lesley, Flora & Johnston, 1980); thus, teachers may be lost if these programs are not strengthened. Steps must be taken to insure that all teacher induction programs adequately support new teachers to decrease teacher attrition rates and to advocate strong instructional strategies.

A review of literature revealed a significant lack of information regarding the induction practices presently occurring throughout the state of Georgia and the perceptions of new teachers' needs of assistance. Dr. Shelby Talley conducted a descriptive study devoted to these issues in 1990, but to this date, another study has not been located describing current programs in the state of Georgia.

This study was intended to provide critical information to Georgia's educational administrators regarding the effectiveness of existing induction practices and to identify concerns of new teachers. The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of

new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia. Specifically, the researcher explored what induction assistance was provided to new teachers in the state of Georgia, as well as the needs of assistance as perceived by these teachers. The research was used to establish if the induction assistance provided is adequate to meet the needs of new teachers in the state of Georgia.

Implementation of the new teacher induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia, according to the findings of this study, was inconsistent and varied widely during the 1999-2000 school year. A quantitative study with a qualitative feature was used to investigate the research questions. The responses to a survey and demographic data from 327 full-time new teachers in the state of Georgia were examined.

Summary of Research Findings

The need to further examine the new teacher induction program in districts across the state of Georgia led to the following overarching research question: What were the perceptions of new teachers towards new teacher induction programs in the state of Georgia? The following research questions further defined the study and are followed by an analysis of the results:

Research Question 1: What were the needs of assistance as perceived by new teachers in the state of Georgia?

Most new teachers in the state of Georgia perceived they were "moderately in need of assistance" regarding each of the needs of assistance items on the survey with responses to individual items ranging from "moderately" to "strongly in need of assistance." The greatest area of assistance was determined to be obtaining materials and supplies followed by preparation time for the new teacher.

Research Question 2: What assistance was provided to new teachers in school districts across the state of Georgia to induct new teachers in the following areas: (a) socialization into the school environment and culture, (b) special consideration in assignments, and (c) professional needs?

Overall, this study found that induction practices to socialize new teachers in Georgia were weak. Attention should be focused on practices that would assist the novice teacher in adapting to the new job and environment. Data regarding assignment factors were found to be both positive and negative. The positive findings were that most teachers were assigned to teaching positions reflective of their training and education and were assigned to a classroom rather than "floating" between classrooms. However, the results of this study verified that special considerations are not common in the state of Georgia regarding the types of students assigned to new teachers, reduction in workloads, or reduction in class sizes. Regarding the professional needs of teachers, again, the data were both positive and negative. Most new teachers were provided adequate information about the evaluation process, appropriate feedback regarding their performance, and the norms of the school were clearly communicated. However, the majority of new teachers were not provided with curricula in a timely manner, new teacher handbooks, or opportunities to observe others and to be observed.

Research Question 3: What were the perceptions of new teachers about the adequacy of existing induction programs in school districts across the state of Georgia?

The data addressing the perceptions of new teachers regarding the adequacy of induction programs across the state of Georgia were somewhat contradictory. The data were overwhelmingly positive indicating that Georgia's new teachers perceive they are receiving "adequate assistance" with these aspects of the induction process. All of the means fell into the "very adequate" category, indicating that Georgia's new teachers perceive the assistance they are receiving in these areas to be more than adequate. The teachers reported the lowest means as preparation time followed by dealing with individual students' problems. A concern, however, arose from the number of "not provided" responses on these items. It appears that if teachers are receiving assistance, it is more than adequate; however, the results indicated that many teachers were not being provided with these important types of support during the first year of teaching.

Research Question 4: What differences, if any, existed in the needs of the teachers among the categories of the following variables: (a) college-degree level, (b) institution from which the participant graduated, and (c) grade level of teaching position?

There was no significant difference found between the relationship existing between the needs of teachers and the variables of college-degree level and institution from which the participant graduated. Regarding the grade level analysis, the analysis determined that there was a significant difference at the .05 level in the responses of the participants based on grade level to three survey items: Item 31: dealing with individual differences with an F value of 2.610; Item 41: awareness of school policies and rules with an F value of 2.374; and Item 43: knowledge of subject matter with an F value of 2.683. However, other than those items, there was no significant relationship between the needs of new teachers and the grade level of teaching position.

Research Question 5: What recommendations, if any, did new teachers have for modifying or improving the induction program in the state of Georgia?

The majority of new teachers in the state of Georgia, 135 (41.3%), recommended continuing the induction program in his or her school district with minor modifications. Open-ended comments were often inconsistent with the quantitative data reported regarding new teachers' need for assistance. It appeared, from reading many of the comments (which are primarily negative), the needs of new teachers were greater than indicated by the quantitative data reported.

Discussion of Research Findings

Demographic Data

The researcher mailed 500 surveys to individuals completing their second year of teaching during the 2000-2001 school year. There were 327 new teachers who returned the questionnaires, generating an overall return rate of 65.4%. Of the respondents, 100 (30.6%) were employed at the primary level (K - 2), 82 (25.1%) taught at the elementary school level (3-5), 80 (24.5%) were employed at middle schools (6-8), and 57 (17.4%)

taught at the secondary level (9-12). What is noteworthy about the new teacher demographic data is that these teachers were overwhelmingly female 276 (84.4%), were Caucasian 272 (83.2%), possessed bachelor's degrees predominantly 293 (89.6%), were certified 316 (96.6%), and graduated from a teacher education program 315 (96.3%). The positive data regarding teachers' certification status and the high number of teacher education program graduates compares favorably to Darling-Hammond's research (1999) and recommendations made by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). The research participants represented 100 of Georgia's 180 school districts and represented 35 different teacher education programs.

Perceptions of Georgia's New Teachers Concerning Their Needs of Assistance

The highest two needs reported by respondents were obtaining materials and supplies with a mean of 2.56 (SD = 1.08) and the need for more preparation time with a mean of 2.43 (SD = 1.16). Since there was no mean score of 3.0 or higher out of a possible 4-point scale, no item could be considered as having a "very strong need." However, eighteen other survey items were classified in the "strong need" category with mean scores ranging between 2.38 and 2.05 out of a possible 4-point scale.

There were six items that ranged from a mean score of 2.00 to a mean score of 1.64 out of a possible 4-point scale. These items included assessing students' work, using textbooks/curriculum guides, working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, relating with principals/administrators, knowledge of subject matter, and relating with other teachers.

There were no questions with means in the 0.000 to 0.999 range indicating that the teachers did not identify themselves as having "no need for assistance" in any of the survey areas. This fact can be interpreted to mean the teachers surveyed did need some assistance in all of the survey areas. The data found compare favorably with

Huling-Austin's (1986), Bishop's (1997), and Darling-Hammond's (1999) research regarding the needs of new teachers.

Classroom discipline was identified as the number one problem of the new teachers surveyed by both Veenman (1984) and Talley (1991). Interestingly, the respondents in this study identified classroom discipline as the number five concern. While Veenman found motivating students, dealing with individual differences, assessing students' work, and relating with parents to be the next top four concerns; this study identified these as numbers 19, 18, 21, and 10 respectively. This researcher found the number one concern to be obtaining materials and supplies followed by preparation time, determining learning levels of students, and dealing with individual student's problems. Veenman identified these concerns as 9,14, and 8 respectively. This data indicates that the needs of new teachers have changed somewhat since Veenman's study in 1984.

Types of Assistance Provided to New Teachers in Georgia

Socialization Factors

With regard to socialization, the induction practice with the highest frequency was system-level orientation for new teachers. This practice occurred for 289 (88.4%) of the 327 respondents. Data from this study indicated that fewer teachers were involved in a school building orientation 67% (219 of 327). Only 63.9% of the new teachers reported being given a tour of the building in which they were employed. Additionally, only 62.7% of the new teachers reported being introduced to support personnel within their school. However, on a positive note, new teachers reported that most administrators 74.3% (243) did clearly communicate norms or expectations of the school and/or district during the recruitment and employment process. This data is somewhat contradictory of the research regarding the importance of administrators in the induction process. Brock and Grady (1996) argue that administrators have the primary responsibility for establishing the tone of the working environment for the new teacher. The building principal must consistently demonstrate support for the success and professional growth of the new teacher

(Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Hughes, 1994; Loucks, 1993; Macdonald, 1999). It is not evident from this data that the practice of administrative support is occurring consistently within all of the schools in Georgia.

A mentor was assigned to the majority of the new teachers (85.6%). This is supportive of Bishop's (1997) recommendations highlighting the important role of a mentor in the career of a new teacher. However, there were still 47 new teachers or 14.4% who reported having no mentor assigned to them to assist them with their transition into the profession. Additionally, there was incredible variation in the amount of support provided or not provided by mentors across the state. The answers ranged from a low of zero (the mentor never met with the new teacher) to a high of meeting daily (after the first month of school). There were 85 (26%) teachers who reported never even meeting with their assigned mentor during their first month of teaching and 65 (19.9%) individuals who reported never meeting with their mentor (after the first month of teaching). This is contradictory to the research regarding mentoring highlighting the importance of the mentoring relationship (Condition of Education, 1999). It is also contradictory to Bishop's (1997) recommendations regarding the characteristics of an effective mentor.

The weakest socialization practice noted by this study was providing assistance in the area of locating housing. Only 7 (2.1%) teachers were provided with assistance in the area of locating housing. A total of 53 (16.2%) reported they were not provided with assistance in this area, and 266 (81.3%) reported they did not need assistance in this area. An additional concern emerging from the data was that the majority 190 (58.1%) of the new teachers indicated not being provided with information about the community in which they were employed. However, in defense of these two concerns, many of the respondents made notations on the questionnaire indicating they student taught at their school or district or grew up in the geographical area of their school. This factor would account for some individuals' lack of need for assistance in these two areas.

Assignment Factors

The second category of induction practices included in Research Question 2 was assignments made to new teachers. The researcher wanted to determine if special consideration was afforded the novice when assignments were made. The results of this study verified that Georgia schools tend to assign new teachers the same workloads, duties, and class sizes. The data in this area indicated that special considerations were not common in the state of Georgia regarding the types of students assigned to new teachers, reduction in workloads, or reduction in class sizes.

Over half, or 168 (51.4%), of the respondents indicated no knowledge of preferential treatment in the assignments of students during their first year of teaching. The majority 290 (88.7%) of the new teachers also indicated they were not given reduced workloads when compared to an experienced teacher. The data also supported the practice of novice teachers being assigned the same class size as their more experienced counterparts as 92% of the teachers reported being given the same class size as other teachers in their school. Additionally, 81.3% reported no reduction in nonteaching duties and responsibilities during their first year. All of this data was contradictory to research supporting the importance of the building principal assigning new teachers to teaching assignments where they can experience success, rather than classrooms which are considered challenging or impossible (Holmes Group, 1986). In addition, this data compared unfavorably to Montgomery's (1981) recommendation regarding the second most cited reason for Georgia teachers leaving the teaching force which was excessive work load. These findings also compared negatively to Talley's (1991) and Bishop's (1997) strong recommendations regarding the importance of teaching assignments during the critical first year.

However, some data related to teaching assignments were positive. Of the new teachers, the majority (90.5%) were assigned to a teaching area reflective of their education and training. Another very positive finding was that 86.5% of beginners were

assigned to their own classroom as opposed to "floating" between classrooms. This data compared favorably to the recommendations made by the Holmes Group (1986) and Huling-Austin (1988).

Professional Needs Factors

The most positive statistic in this area was regarding the teacher evaluation process. It was reported that 91.4% of the new teachers were provided adequate feedback regarding their performance after an administrative observation. Additionally, 90.2% of the novice teachers indicated being provided adequate information about the evaluation process. This data supports the findings of Vann in 1989 regarding the importance of providing frequent and helpful feedback and encouragement from the building level leader responsible for supervising the novice teacher.

The lowest percentage in this area was that only 37.9% of the teachers were provided with meetings with their principal during the critical first few weeks of school. Teachers also reported that only 51.7% or slightly over half of the principals observed them (other than to meet mandated requirements) during the first year. This fact does not reflect the research completed by Montgomery in 1981 citing new teachers' reasons for leaving the teaching profession which was a lack of support from competent administrators. It is also contradictory to the research completed by Loucks (1993), Vann (1989), and Anzul (2000) reflecting the important role of a school administrator during the teacher's critical first year of teaching.

Another area of concern was that a handbook designed specifically for new teachers was provided to only 55.7% of the new teachers. Also, appropriate curricula (textbooks, curriculum guides, etc.) were provided to only about half (55%) of the new teachers prior to the week of pre-planning. Only 56.6% of the new teachers reported having the opportunity to observe an experienced teacher and even fewer, 51.1% identified another teacher as having the opportunity to observe them and provide feedback. This data was contradictory to all the research reflecting the importance of

providing materials and allowing new teachers the opportunity to observe others and to be observed (Holmes Group, 1986 & Huling-Austin, 1988).

Perceptions of Georgia's New Teachers Regarding the Adequacy of Existing Induction Programs

The data addressing this concern were somewhat contradictory. The data were overwhelmingly positive indicating that Georgia's new teachers perceive they are receiving "adequate assistance" with these aspects of the induction process. All of the means fell into the "very adequate" category, indicating that Georgia's new teachers perceive the assistance they are receiving in these areas to be more than "adequate." The lowest areas of adequacy of assistance were preparation time and dealing with individual student's problems. Although, even the two lowest means were identified by respondents at the 3.0 level out of a possible 4-point scale. This data supported the research and recommendations of the Holmes Group (1986), Veenman (1984), Huling-Austin (1988), Talley (1991), and Bishop (1997).

A concern, however, arose from the number of "not provided" responses on these items. If teachers are receiving assistance, it is more than adequate; however, the results indicated that many teachers were not being provided with many of these important types of support during the first year of teaching. Obviously, this finding was contradictory to the research and recommendations of the Holmes Group (1986), Veenman (1984), Huling-Austin (1988), Talley (1991), and Bishop (1997).

Differences Between the Perception of New Teachers Based on Specific Demographic Variables

College-degree Level. Results of the analysis of variance indicated no significant relationship between the college-degree level and the needs of new teachers F (1, 208) = .725, p = .494, indicating whether a teacher obtained a bachelor's degree or a master's degree had no effect on his or her needs during the first year of teaching. Both levels of participants reported having similar needs during the first year in the classroom. The

additional years of education (graduate work) appeared to have no significant effect (positive or negative) on the participants' needs during the first year.

Institution from Which Participant Graduated. There was no significant relationship identified through the analysis of variance between the institution from which the participant graduated and his or her needs during their first year of teaching F (34, 172) = .852, p = .679. This indicated that the factor of institution had no effect on the new teachers' needs during the first year. All participants reported having similar needs during the first year in the classroom regardless of the institution from which he or she obtained the degree. However, it was determined that this analysis may not be meaningful due to the large number of categories in this analysis. There were 35 institutions represented by the 327 participants in this study. The high number of variables being considered indicated the researcher may be wasting degrees of freedom through the analysis; hence, losing the power of the test and the validity of the results. Therefore, the results may not be considered to be significant regarding this factor.

Grade Level of Teaching Position. The results of the analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference at the .05 level in the responses of the participants based on grade level on only three survey items: Item 31; dealing with individual differences with an F value of 2.610; Item 41: awareness of school policies and rules with an F value of 2.374; and Item 43: knowledge of subject matter with an F value of 2.683. Other than these items, there was no significant relationship between the needs of new teachers and the grade level of teaching position as indicated by the analysis of variance, F (3, 211) = 1.183, p = .413. This indicated that grade level had very little effect on the teacher's needs during his or her first year of teaching except for those aforementioned items. Whether a teacher was employed at the primary, elementary, middle, or secondary school level or employed in special education or the "other" category seemed to have no effect on his or her needs during the first year of teaching. All six levels of participants reported having similar needs during the first year in the classroom. The participants' grade level

appeared to have no significant effect (positive or negative) on the participants' needs during the first year.

New Teachers' Recommendations For Modifying or Improving the Induction Program in the State of Georgia

Of the participants, 101 (30.9%) recommended continuing the existing induction program in their school district without modification. The majority of respondents or135 (41.3%), recommended continuing the program with minor modifications, while 63 (19.3%) suggested that the program be continued with major modifications. Only 25 (7.6%) individuals recommended that the program in their district be replaced with a different type of program.

There was an noticeable amount of feedback from the open-ended qualitative question (Item 58). Interestingly, there were only 91 respondents who chose not to respond to the qualitative component. All of these individuals indicated they wanted the program to be continued without modification. Of the 236 respondents choosing to respond to this item, the researcher separated the 443 ideas into 34 concepts. Open-ended comments were often inconsistent with the quantitative data reported regarding new teachers' need for assistance. The needs of new teachers seem to be greater than that indicated by the quantitative data reported from the comments.

Most of the open-ended comments supported the literature regarding the components which should be included in a comprehensive induction program. Many participants reiterated the idea that induction programs should be specific to the context in which the new teacher is assigned to work (Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1985).

Many of the open-ended comments are reflective of Lawson's (1992) argument that in the process of developing pre-packaged induction programs educators have neglected the changing new teacher's needs. He suggested teaching is an intellectual, moral and political endeavor and many current induction programs focus attention on

developing each teacher's technical competencies at the expense of ignoring other vital aspects of development.

The biggest concern reflected the quality of support provided by the mentors. The qualitative data contradicted the research in this area. Bishop (1997) argued administrators must be wise and discerning in their selection of an appropriate mentor for the new teacher. Jones and Walter (1994) reiterated the importance of administrators making careful choices in this area. Huffman & Leak (1986) and Loucks (1993) repeatedly encouraged administrators to provide adequate time for informal and formal conferencing and planning between the new teacher and the mentor. Quantitative and qualitative data from this study do not reflect this recommendation.

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Results to Current Study

Qualitatively comparing the current findings with the findings of Dr. Shelby Talley in 1990 enabled the researcher to analyze changes that have occurred in the state of Georgia during the decade since her study was conducted. Tables XVI - XXII identify the significant findings in comparing the two studies. The most significant positive finding between the two studies was the percentage of teachers currently being assigned a mentor (85.6%) as opposed to the number assigned a mentor a decade ago (56.7%). Another positive finding was that formal mentor programs have been established in 68.5% of the respondent's school districts compared to 27% of the districts at the time of Talley's survey in 1990. Although districts' mentoring programs are not faultless, positive improvements have been made in the past 11 years in the area of mentoring.

The findings in the area of considerations of assignments were very similar. Dr. Talley reported 55.2% of the teachers reported no special considerations were given to the kinds of students given to them, and 93% were not given reduced class sizes. This

Table XVI

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001

Rank Order of Georgia's New Teachers' Needs of Assistance

Talley's results	Wilson's results
Classroom discipline Mean = 2.8	Obtaining materials and supplies Mean = 2.6
Burden of clerical work Mean = 2.7	Preparation time Mean = 2.4
Motivating students Mean = 2.6	Determining learning levels of students Mean = 2.4
Dealing with student problems Mean = 2.6	Dealing with student problems Mean = 2.4
Working with slow learners Mean = 2.6	Classroom discipline Mean = 2.4
Obtaining materials and supplies Mean = 2.6	*Technology as an instructional tool Mean = 2.3
Effective use of methods or strategies Mean = 2.5	Effective use of methods or strategies Mean = 2.3
Determining learning levels of students Mean = 2.5	*Technology as a teaching resource Mean = 2.3
Obtaining guidance and support Mean = 2.5	Obtaining adequate equipment Mean = 2.3
Dealing with individual differences Mean = 2.5	Relating with parents Mean = 2.3
Preparation time Mean = 2.4	Obtaining guidance and support Mean = 2.2

Note. *Indicates items not included on Talley's original survey

Table XVI (continued)

Talley's results	Wilson's results
Relating with parents Mean = 2.2	Working with diverse learners Mean = 2.2
Organizing classwork (content) Mean = 2.2	*Technology as a management tool Mean = 2.2
Awareness of school policies Mean = 2.2	Awareness of school policies Mean = 2.2
Planning lessons and activities Mean = 2.2	Clerical Work Mean = 2.2
Obtaining adequate equipment Mean = 2.2	Planning lessons and activities Mean = 2.2
Using textbooks/curriculum guides Mean = 2.1	Organizing classwork (content) Mean = 2.2
Efficient use of time Mean = 2.1	Dealing with individual differences Mean = 2.1
Assessing students' work Mean = 1.8	Motivating students Mean = 2.1
Ethnic and cultural backgrounds Mean = 1.8	Efficient use of time Mean = 2.0
Knowledge of subject matter Mean = 1.7	Assessing students' work Mean = 2.0
Relating with administrators Mean = 1.7	Using textbooks/curriculum guides Mean = 2.0
Relating with other teachers Mean = 1.6	Ethnic and cultural backgrounds Mean = 1.8

Table XVI (continued)

Talley's results	Wilson's results
	Relating with administrators Mean = 1.8
	Knowledge of subject matter Mean = 1.8
	Relating with other teachers Mean =1.6

Table XVII

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001 of Georgia's New Teachers' Needs of Assistance

Item	Description	Talley's mean	Wilson's mean
29	Classroom discipline	2.8	2.4
30	Motivating students	2.6	2.1
31	Dealing with individual differences	2.5	2.1
32	Assessing students' work	1.8	2.0
33	Relating with parents	2.2	2.3
34	Organizing classwork (content)	2.2	2.2
35	Obtaining materials and supplies	2.6	2.6
36	Dealing with student problems	2.6	2.4
37	Preparation time	2.4	2.4
38	Relating with other teachers	1.6	1.6
39	Planning lessons and activities	2.2	2.2
40	Effective use of methods or strategies	2.5	2.3
41	Awareness of school policies	2.2	2.2
42	Determining learning levels of students	2.5	2.4
43	Knowledge of subject matter	1.7	1.8
44	Clerical work	2.7	2.2
45	Relating with administrators	1.7	1.8
46	Obtaining adequate equipment	2.2	2.3

Table XVII (continued)

Item	Description	Talley's mean	Wilson's mean
47	Working with diverse learners	2.6	2.2
48	Ethnic and cultural backgrounds	1.8	1.8
49	Using textbooks/curriculum guides	2.1	2.0
50	Efficient use of time	2.1	2.0
51	Obtaining guidance and support	2.5	2.2
52	*Technology as a management tool		2.2
53	*Technology as a teaching resource		2.3
54	*Technology as an instructional tool		2.3

Note. *Indicates items not included on Talley's original survey

Table XVIII

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001

Socialization of Georgia's New Teachers Into School Environment and Culture

Talley's results			Wilson's results	
Yes %	No %		Yes %	No %
81.9	17	System level orientation	88.4	11.5
57	41.9	School building orientation	67	31.4
56.7	43.3	Mentor assigned	85.6	14.4
58.9	40.7	Guided tour of school given	63.9	35.2
58.1	41.5	Introduced to support personnel in school	62.7	35.2
13.3	85.2	Offered assistance in securing housing	2.1	16.2
37.8	68.7	Provided information about community	29.4	58.1
65.2	34.8	Clearly articulated norms or expectations	74.3	25.4

Table XIX

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001

Georgia's New Teachers' Special Considerations in Assignments

Talley's results			Wilson's results	
Yes %	No %		Yes %	No %
27.4	55.2	Student assignment	25.4	51.4
3.0	91.4	Reduced workload	5.2	88.7
4.4	93	Reduced class sizes	3.7	92
11.5	78.9	Reduced nonteaching duties and responsibilities	14.7	81.3
86.7	13	Assigned teaching area that matched training	90.5	90.2
87.4	12.6	Assigned classroom opposed to "floating"	86.5	12.8
43	57	Opportunity to observe experienced teacher	56.7	43.3
50.4	48.5	Opportunity to attend staff development	60.9	38.2
33.7	65.6	Opportunity for experienced teacher to observe	51.1	48.6

Table XIX (continued)

Talley's results			Wilson's results	
Yes %	No %		Yes %	No %
47	53	Principal observed other than mandated assessments	51.7	47.7
91.5	8.5	Provided adequate information about evaluation process	90.2	9.5
77.8	21.9	Provided adequate feedback about performance	91.4	8.3

Table XX

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001

Georgia's New Teachers' Professional Needs

Talley's results			Wilson's results	
Yes %	No %		Yes %	No %
61.1	38.5	New teacher handbook provided	55.7	43.7
27	71.1	Formal mentoring program in system	68.5	29.7
34.8	64.4	Scheduled meetings with principal	37.9	61.8
46.7	53	Provided curriculum before pre-planning	55	43.7

Table XXI

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001

Rank Order of Georgia's New Teachers' Adequacy of Assistance

Talley's results	Wilson's results
Awareness of school policies Mean = 2.5	Relating with other teachers Mean = 3.6
Obtaining adequate school equipment Mean = 2.4	Knowledge of subject matter Mean = 3.5
Obtaining sufficient materials and supplies Mean = 2.3	Relating with administrators Mean = 3.4
Classroom discipline Mean = 2.2	Using textbooks/curriculum guides Mean = 3.3
Dealing with students' problems Mean = 2.1	Organizing classwork (content) Mean = 3.3
Relating with administrators Mean = 2.0	Clerical work Mean = 3.3
Obtaining guidance and support Mean = 2.0	Assessing students' work Mean = 3.3
Determining learning levels Mean = 1.8	Ethnic and cultural backgrounds Mean = 3.3
Relating with other teachers Mean = 1.7	Awareness of school policies Mean = 3.2
Planning lessons and activities Mean = 1.7	Dealing with individual differences Mean = 3.2

Note. * Indicates items not included on Talley's original survey

Table XXI (continued)

Talley's results	Wilson's results
Effective use of methods or strategies Mean = 1.7	Obtaining guidance and support Mean = 3.21
Working with diverse learners Mean = 1.7	Relating with parents Mean = 3.2
Motivating students Mean = 1.6	*Technology as an instructional tool Mean = 3.2
Relating with parents Mean = 1.6	Efficient use of time Mean = 3.2
Organizing classwork (content) Mean = 1.6	Planning lessons and activities Mean = 3.2
Preparation time Mean = 1.6	*Technology as teaching resource Mean = 3.2
Clerical work Mean = 1.6	Effective use of methods or strategies Mean = 3.2
Using textbooks/curriculum guides Mean = 1.6	Motivating students Mean = 3.1
Dealing with individual differences Mean = 1.5	Obtaining materials and supplies Mean = 3.1
Efficient use of time Mean = 1.5	*Technology as management tool Mean = 3.1
Assessing students' work Mean = 1.4	Working with diverse learners Mean = 3.1
Knowledge of subject matter Mean = 1.4	Obtaining adequate school equipment Mean = 3.1

Table XXI (continued)

Talley's results	Wilson's results
Ethnic and cultural backgrounds Mean = 1.3	Classroom discipline Mean = 3.1 Determining student learning levels Mean = 3.0 Dealing with students' problems Mean = 3.0 Preparation time Mean = 3.0

Table XXII

Comparison of Talley's 1990 Findings to Data Reported in 2001

Georgia's New Teachers' Adequacy of Assistance

Item	Description	Talley's mean	Wilson's mean
29	Classroom discipline	2.2	3.1
30	Motivating students	1.6	3.1
31	Dealing with individual differences	1.5	3.2
32	Assessing students' work	1.4	3.3
33	Relating with parents	1.6	3.2
34	Organizing classwork (content)	1.6	3.3
35	Obtaining materials and supplies	2.3	3.1
36	Dealing with student problems	2.1	3.0
37	Preparation time	1.6	3.0
38	Relating with other teachers	1.7	3.6
39	Planning lessons and activities	1.7	3.2
40	Effective use of methods or strategies	1.7	3.2
41	Awareness of policies	2.5	3.2
42	Determining learning levels	1.8	3.0
43	Knowledge of subject matter	1.4	3.5
44	Clerical work	1.6	3.3
45	Relating with administrators	2.0	3.4

Table XXII (continued)

Item	Description	Talley's mean	Wilson's mean
46	Obtaining adequate school equipment	2.4	3.1
47	Working with diverse learners	1.7	3.1
48	Ethnic and cultural backgrounds	1.3	3.3
49	Using textbooks/curriculum guides	1.6	3.3
50	Efficient use of time	1.5	3.2
51	Obtaining guidance and support	2.0	3.2
52	*Technology as a management tool		3.1
53	*Technology as a teaching resource		3.2
54	*Technology as an instructional tool		3.2

Note. *Indicates items not included on Talley's original survey

study indicated 51.4% of the respondents were provided with no special considerations regarding student assignment, and 92% were not given reduced class sizes.

Talley also reported that 78.9% reported no reduction in nonteaching duties and responsibilities, and 91.4% of new teachers reported no reduction in workload. Again, data from this study indicated that 81.3% of the teachers were given no reduction in nonteaching duties and responsibilities and 88.7% were provided with no reduction in workload. The similarity of this data indicated that practices have not significantly changed since Talley's study was conducted 11 years ago.

Regarding the socialization of new teachers, the means of each item have increased since 1990, except the items reflecting assistance in locating housing and providing information about the community. This can be interpreted to mean that although districts are not meeting the needs of all teachers in this area, some improvements have been made in this area in the past 11 years.

The data from this study indicated the top five new teacher needs during the 1999-2000 school year were: obtaining materials and supplies, preparation time, determining learning levels of students, dealing with student problems, and classroom discipline. Talley's results indicated the top needs as classroom discipline, burden of clerical work, motivating students, dealing with student problems, and working with slow learners. A comparison of the means of each of the items in this rank ordering were very similar and indicated that the needs of the new teachers have not changed considerably in the past 11 years.

Another significant finding was in the area of the adequacy of assistance provided to new teachers across the state of Georgia. The means reported by new teachers for all of the survey items were significantly higher in 1999-2000 than those reported in Talley's original study 11 years ago. All of the means were 3.0 or above, indicating that new teachers perceive that their needs are adequately being met in the state of Georgia. This

can be interpreted to mean that Georgia school districts are doing a much better job meeting the needs of new teachers than 11 years ago.

Conclusions

1. During the 1999-2000 school year, new teachers in the state of Georgia were provided sufficient induction assistance in the following areas: system-level orientations, assignment of a mentor, being assigned to classrooms as opposed to "floating," being assigned to the teaching area best reflected in their training, being provided adequate information and feedback about the evaluation process and individual teaching performance.
2. During the 1999-2000 school year, new teachers in the state of Georgia were provided insufficient induction assistance in the following areas: school level orientation, assistance in securing housing, being provided with a new teacher handbook, information about the community, special considerations in the areas of student assignments, workload, class sizes, and duties and responsibilities, support for teachers hired late, opportunities to meet with the principal, and textbooks and curriculum guides prior to pre-planning. In addition, although mentors were assigned, they were often categorized as ineffective, unavailable, and not always helpful to new teachers.
3. Other areas that were not categorized as either effective or ineffective, but new teachers perceived as needing additional attention were: providing a tour of the school, being introduced to support personnel within the school and the need for additional observation opportunities during the first year.

Implications

These findings should assist Georgia educators and legislators as they plan for instructional programs to assist new teachers. The findings of this study will be shared with the Georgia Department of Education, the Georgia Leadership Academy, and Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs) for use in the Georgia Mentor Teacher Program. Additionally, the data may provide information to justify or re-evaluate the

continuation of funding for mentor programs across the state. School system staff development coordinators and other school administrators can use the research results for continuous program improvement within their respective school districts.

Other audiences for this study include colleges of education and national and state professional organizations. These organizations can use this data in evaluating and strengthening existing and future support systems and programs for new teachers. Professors of education can use this data in curriculum planning to narrow the discrepancy between what pre-service teachers are currently being taught and what new teachers identify as necessary components of training programs. Educational leadership professors can utilize this research to assist aspiring and current school administrators in identifying the characteristics of effective induction programs and in recognizing their critical role as administrators in supporting new teachers.

1. Teacher induction programs designed in the future in Georgia should include as many of the 57 components/practices as feasible (i.e., as apply to the local context).
2. Programs will need to be as flexible as necessary to accommodate the individual needs of the persons/groups involved.
3. Collaboration between teacher preparation institutions and the school districts must be strengthened and its importance recognized by the participants in the teacher induction programs.
4. New teachers need to be individually supported and should receive strong and specific feedback and recognition prior to the beginning of school and during the first few weeks of school.
5. The importance of the mentoring relationship cannot be underestimated and should be the cornerstone of all induction programs.

Dissemination

The findings of this study will be shared with the Georgia Department of Education, the Georgia Leadership Academy, and Regional Educational Service Agencies

(RESAs) for use in the Georgia Mentor Teacher Program. Other audiences for this study include colleges of education and national and state professional organizations. Additionally, the researcher intends to analyze more fully the qualitative data provided by the participants and plans to publish articles exploring the issues generated by those comments. Finally, the researcher plans to present the findings of this study at regional and national conferences.

Recommendations

The data presented in this study indicated that inconsistencies have existed in the implementation of programs designed to support new teachers in Georgia. Therefore, Colleges of Education, the Georgia State Department of Education and school district administrators should be interested in the results of this study. These results could be utilized as the basis for additional investigation into the wide variations in program implementation designed to ease the transition of new teachers into the classroom. The results of this study can be used by these organizations in developing materials and resources which support administrators in their efforts to develop successful new teacher induction programs in each school district across the state of Georgia.

The recommendations of this researcher are made with the intent of strengthening and improving new teacher induction programs in Georgia. Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made:

Recommendations for Colleges and Universities

1. College and university personnel who teach undergraduate and graduate education courses should become aware of the components of effective induction programs and comprehensively address these issues in class with students.
2. Professors who teach leadership and administration classes should include instruction in the needs of new teachers and the role of the administrator in supporting the novice teacher.

3. Colleges and university personnel should collaborate with the Georgia Department of Education and local school districts to develop a model program guide for school districts to use in strengthening or developing their school district's new teacher induction program.
4. Colleges of education need to examine the support systems offered by their institution to new teacher graduates during his/her first year of teaching. Educational institutions need to provide some type of support system which addresses the needs of new teachers. Student teaching needs to be linked with the induction process in an effort to prepare teachers more effectively and to provide a continuous and comprehensive support system to new graduates.

Recommendations for the Georgia Department of Education

1. The Georgia Department of Education should assume responsibility for designing a model new teacher induction program guide reflecting the unique needs of new teachers in the state.
2. The Georgia Department of Education needs to make recommendations or policy requiring local school districts to provide a comprehensive new teacher induction program to meet the needs of new teachers in the state of Georgia.
3. A formal investigation should be initiated into the Georgia Teacher Mentor Program designed to evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the needs of new teachers.
4. Expectations for new teachers need to be revisited and changed. As administrators make assignments, special considerations should be provided to new teachers. Novice teachers should be given modified workloads, fewer problem students, additional time for planning, fewer students, fewer responsibilities and duties, release time to observe other teachers and the opportunity to participate in staff development designed to reflect the unique needs of new teachers. Funds need to be appropriated to enable administrators the discretion to make these special assignments.

Recommendations for Principals and Assistant Principals in the State of Georgia

1. Communication between the school administrators and the new teacher should be increased and strengthened. As the instructional leader of the school, the principal should take the initiative to ensure the success of all first year teachers he or she hires. An administrator (possibly an assistant principal or Instructional Lead Teacher) in the school needs to be assigned with the responsibility of inducting new teachers in the school. This administrator needs to be responsible for providing a new teacher handbook, giving the new teachers a tour of the school building, providing curricula and curriculum guides at the earliest date, providing introductions to support personnel, and providing needed assistance with housing and information about the community.
2. This administrator needs to be responsible for providing ongoing and comprehensive support for the new teacher throughout their first year. They should schedule formal and informal meetings with the new teachers to discuss concerns, upcoming events, expectations, unwritten norms, and provide a system through which teachers can be observed and observe other teachers in the school.
3. The administrator responsible for supervising new teachers should also serve as a liaison between the mentor and the new teacher to make certain the needs of the mentee are being met.
4. This school level administrator also needs to observe the new teacher regularly (both formally and informally) to support the new teacher and encourage growth.
5. Plans need to be made at the school level to induct teachers who are considered to be "late hires" (hired during or after pre-planning).
6. Finally, the building-level principal must assume responsibility for making wise decisions regarding assignments made to the first year teacher in his or her school. The administrator should be careful not to assign the new teacher difficult students,

overwhelming workloads, large class sizes, and extra duties and unnecessary assignments.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the review of literature and the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research are made:

1. A longitudinal follow-up study should be completed on this population to determine how the new teacher's perceptions regarding teacher induction programs relate to actual outcomes and teacher retention rates.
2. A replication of this study should be carried out to compare the impact of district wealth and size on new teacher satisfaction and retention.
3. The feasibility of repeating this study with a larger sample size needs to be investigated.
4. Research should be conducted to determine if a relationship exists between support needed and support provided, and demographic factors such as gender of principal, size of school, gender of teacher, years of administrative experience, and degree level. While this study produced some of this demographic information, no attempt was made to correlate demographics to participant responses.
5. This study should be replicated in another state or multiple states and findings compared to those found in this study pertaining to Georgia.
6. A qualitative study should be conducted interviewing selected new teachers from each grade level reflecting their experiences as a first year teacher in the state.
7. An investigation into the issue of accountability of the Georgia Mentor Teacher Program needs to be conducted in the state of Georgia. This researcher found several instances of a teacher being assigned a mentor (through State Department records) and the teacher indicating his or her mentor never met with him/her. It would be interesting to conduct a full study investigating this issue more thoroughly.

8. Research needs to be conducted comparing the responses of individuals by school district. While this study produced this information, no attempt was made to isolate and correlate between school district location and the participant's responses.
9. Finally, this study should be replicated in five years to determine if any changes or progress has been made in the support programs offered to new teachers in the state of Georgia.

Final Comments

Statistics indicated that over 2 million new teachers will be hired in the United States within the next 10 years. Not surprisingly, the success and retention of these teachers will continue to be a major focus within the field of education. Without the support of administrators and qualified and caring mentors, new teachers will not experience success in the classroom. Educational leaders must work in partnership with new teachers, agreeing to provide the support and resources new teachers need to succeed.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E., & Shannon, A. (1987). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), 38-42.

Andrew, M. D., & Schwab, R. L. (1995). Has reform in teacher education influenced teacher performance? An outcome assessment of graduates of 11 teacher education programs. Action in Teacher Education, 17(3), 43-53.

Andrews, T. E., & Andrews, L. (Eds.) (1998). The NASDTEC Manual 1998-1999. Manual on the Preparation and Certification of Educational Personnel. Dubuque, IA: Dendall/Hunt.

Anzul, J. C. (2000). Teacher team develops a district mentoring program. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 36(2), 65-67.

Ashburn, E. A. (1987). Current developments in teacher induction programs. Action in Teacher Education, 8(4), 41-44.

Babbie, E. (1990). The practice of social research (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ballinger, J. (2000). Programs aim to stop teacher washout. Journal of Staff Development, 21(2), 28-33.

Bercik, J. T., & Blair-Larsen, S. (1989, November). New/returning teachers: A perspective of their induction year needs. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 394)

Bishop, N. R. (1997). Selection and assignment of Georgia teacher support specialists (mentors): Perceptions of principals and beginning teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58/09, 3372.

Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1989). Educational research (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Bringaze, P. A. (1988). A descriptive study of the effectiveness of beginning teachers in selected Illinois school district induction programs (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49/10, 2907.

Brock, B. L. & Grady, M. L. (1996, August). Beginning teacher induction programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors in Educational Administration in Corpus Christi, TX.

Brulle, A., & Allred, K. (1991, March). Teacher induction in rural areas: A challenge for all. Paper presented at the Rural Education Symposium in Nashville, TN.

Camp, W. G., & Heath, B. (Eds.). (1988). On becoming a teacher: Vocational education and the induction process (Monograph No. MDS018). Berkeley, CA: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Camp, W. G., & Heath-Camp, B. (1991). On becoming a teacher: "They just gave me a key and said, 'Good luck.' " National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 517)

Chase, B. (1998). NEA's Role: Cultivating teacher professionalism. Educational Leadership, 55(5), 18-20.

Colbert, J. A., & Wolff, D. E. (1992). Surviving in urban schools: A collaborative model for a beginning teacher support system. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 193-199.

Columbia Group. (2000). Teachers and teaching in the southeast. [WWW document]. URL http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/sla/pubrev/pr

Cresswell, J. W. (1994). Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronk, B. C. (1999). How to use SPSS: A step-by-step guide to analysis and interpretation. Los Angeles: Pyrczak.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. Educational Leadership, 55(5), 6-11.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Professional development for teachers: Setting the stage for learning from teaching. The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. [WWW document]. URL http://www.cftl.org

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999, August). Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child. National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. [WWW document]. URL http://www.tc.columbia.edu/

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, Haselkorn & Fideler. (1999). "Teacher Recruitment, Selection, and Induction: Strategies for Transforming the Teaching Profession," in Darling-Hammond, L. & Sykes, G. (eds.) Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. M. (1996). Who teaches and why. Dilemmas of building a profession for twenty-first century schools. In Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, second edition, J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds), pp. 67-101. New York: Macmillan.

Elias, P., Fisher, M., & Simon, R. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers through the first year: A review of the literature. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 780)

Eye, G. G., & Lane, W. R. (1956). The new teacher comes to school. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Fagan, M. M., & Walter, G. (1982). Mentoring among teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 76(2), 113-117.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6th Ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Teacher mentors: A review of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 6-11.

Ganser, T. (1991, October). Matching beginning teachers and mentors: Perceptions of participants in a state-mandated mentoring program. Paper presented at the Diversity in Mentoring Conference for the Mentoring Association, Chicago.

Ganser, T., & Koskela, R. (1997). A comparison of six Wisconsin mentoring programs for beginning teachers. NASSP Bulletin, 81(591), 71-80.

Georgia Alliance for Public Education (1990). [Pamphlet]. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Georgia Board of Education Rule 160-3-3-.07. (1997). Mentor Teacher Program. Adopted by the Georgia Board of Education on August 14, 1997. Effective: September 3, 1997. [WWW document]. URL http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/legalservices/rules.asp

Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support. Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In C.B. Courtney (Ed.) Review of Research in Education, 16, (pp. 548-594). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Goodson-Rochelle, P. A. (1998). New teacher induction programs in Tennessee: Formal, informal and influential practices (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 1998). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60/02, 392.

Hackman, R. J., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Halford, J. M. (1998). Easing the way for new teachers. Educational Leadership, 55(5), 33-36.

Heck, R. H., & Blaine, D. D. (1989, March). The effects of a colleague-pairing induction program on the perceptions of first-year teachers and their mentors. San Francisco: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Hoffman, J. V., Edwards, S. A., O'Neal, S., Barnes, S., & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 16-21.

Hoge, H. D. (1991). The Pennsylvania teacher induction program: A comparative study of teacher and administrator observations (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International 52/12, 4163.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Huffman, G., & Leak, S. (1986). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentors. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 22-25.

Hughes, L. W. (Ed.). (1994). The principal as leader. New York: Macmillan.

Huling-Austin, L. (1985). Teacher induction programs: What is and isn't reasonable to expect. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education Review, 3(3), 1-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1988, April). Teacher induction, Texas directors of field experiences. Paper presented at the Spring Conference on Teacher Education, El Paso, TX.

Huling-Austin, L. (1989). A synthesis of research on teacher induction programs and practices. In J. Reinhartz (Ed.), Teacher induction (pp. 13-33). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). New teacher induction: An interview with Leslie Huling-Austin. Journal of Staff Development, 11(4), 2-10.

Huling-Austin, L., & Murphy, S. C. (1987, April). Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 779)

Huling-Austin, L., Odell, S., Ishler, P., Kay, R., & Edelfelt, R. (Eds.). (1989). Assisting the beginning teacher. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). MTIP satellite conference proceedings (Report No. 7209). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hunt, D. W. (1968). Teacher induction: An opportunity and a responsibility. NASSP Bulletin, 52, 330.

Hussar, W. J. (1999, October). Predicting the need for newly hired teachers in the United States to 2008-09. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 435 596)

Jensen, M. C. (1986). Induction programs support new teachers and strengthen their schools. Eugene: Oregon School Study Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 012)

Jones, J. J., & Walters, S. L. (1994). Human resource management in education. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Kay, P. M., & Sabatini, A. (1988). A research based internship for emergency credentialed teachers. (Report No. NIE-R-85-0012). New York: Baruch College, The City University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 238)

Kentucky Department of Education. (1999, July). Kentucky Teacher Internship Program: Questions and answers. [WWW document]. URL http://www.kde.state.ky.us/otec/intern/ktip/kTipQ&A.asp

Kestner, J. L. (1994). New teacher induction: Findings of the research and implications for minority groups. Journal of Teacher Education, 45(1), 39-45.

Kling, R. E., & Brookhart, D. A. (1991). Mentoring: A review of related literature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 095)

Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), 607-610.

Lawson, H. A. (1992). Beyond the new conception of teacher induction. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 163-172.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loucks, H. E. (1993). Teacher induction: A success story. Principal, 73, 27-29.

Love, F. E., & Rowland, S. T. (1999). The ABCs of mentoring beginning teachers. Dimensions of Early Childhood, 27(4), 8-10.

Mark, J. H., & Anderson, B. D. (1985). Teacher survival rates in St. Louis, 1969-1982. American Educational Research Journal, 22, 413-421.

McArthur, J. T. (1978). What does teaching do to teachers? Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 89-103.

McClave, J. T., Benson, P.G., Sincich, T. (2001). Statistics for business and economics. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

McDonald, F. J. (1980). The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in training: Vol. I. Study of induction programs for beginning teachers. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

McDonald, F. T., & Elias, P. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Montgomery, M. B. (1981). Teacher attrition: A study of beginning public school teachers in a seven-county region of Georgia (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42/10, 4412.

Morey, A. I. (1990). Introduction. In A. I. Morey & D. S. Murphy (Eds.), Designing programs for new teachers: The California experience (pp. 1-8). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Morgan, J., & Ashbaker, B. (2000). Supporting new teachers: Practical suggestions for experienced staff. Rural Educator, 22(1), 35-37.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's Future. New York: Author, Teachers College Columbia University.

Odell, S. J., & Ferraro, D. P. (1992). Teacher mentoring and teacher retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 200-204.

Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation. (1986). The induction of new teachers (Fastback #237). Bloomington, IN: .

Portner, H. (1998). Mentoring new teachers. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Reinhartz, J. (1989). The teacher induction process: Preserving the old and welcoming the new: An introduction. In J. Reinhartz (Ed.), Teacher induction (pp. 4-12). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education, 93, 352-387.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Runyan, C. K. (1999). Mentoring: Aim and Assess. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 12(4), 14-17.

Runyan, K, White, V, Hazel, L, & Hedges, D. (1998). A seamless system of professional development from preservice to tenured teaching. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417 167)

Ryan, K., Newman, K. K., Mager, G., Applegate, J., Lesley, T., Flora, R., & Johnston, J. (1980). Biting the apple: Accounts of first-year teachers. New York: Longman.

Schaffer, E., Stringfield, S., & Wolfe, D. (1992). An innovative teacher induction program: A two-year analysis of classroom interactions. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 181-192.

Schlechty, P., & Vance, V. (1983). Recruitment, selection and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 468-487.

Schmoll, B. J. (1983, May). The making of a mentor-mentee relationship. Paper presented at the Annual Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult and Continuing Education, DeKalb, IL.

Sclan, E. M., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). Beginning teacher performance evaluation: An overview of state policies. Trends and Issues Paper No. 7. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Southworth, S. A. (2000). Wanted: Two million teachers. Instructor, 109(5), 25-27.

Talley, S. J. (1991). Induction assistance for beginning teachers in the state of Georgia (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52/05, 1603.

Tellez, K. (1992). Mentors by choice, not design: Help-seeking by beginning teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 214-221.

U.S. Department of Education. (1996). Findings from the condition of education 1996: Teachers' working conditions. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

U.S. Department of Education (1999). Condition of Education, 1998. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffing Survey 1993-94 and Follow-up Survey 1994-95. [WWW document]. URL http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/condition98

U.S. Department of Education (2000). Condition of Education, 1999. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. [WWW document]. URL http://nces.ed.gov/pubs99/condition99

Vann, A. S. (1989). A principal's guide to the hiring and induction of new teachers. Principal, 69, 26-29.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Wildman, T. M., Magliaro, S. G., Niles, R. A., & Niles, J. A. (1992). Teacher mentoring: An analysis of roles, activities, and conditions. Journal of Teacher Education, 43(3), 205-213.

Yasin, S. (1999). The supply and demand of elementary and secondary school teachers in the United States. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 435 529)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE ON CERTIFIED PERSONNEL INFORMATION

Subject: Your Data Request
Date: Tue, 30 Jan 2001 12:10:15 -0500
From: Winifred Nweke <Winifred.Nweke@GAPSC.com>
To: judiwilson@earthlink.net
CC: Tom Hall <Tom.Hall@GAPSC.com>

Ms. Wilson, Hello,

Your data request was passed on to me. As Dr. Tom Hall wrote in his mail to you, we do not have a database of Mentor Teachers with their assignments.

The attached Excel file contains information on FY00 Beginning Teachers. These are teachers, prepared in Georgia, who did their Student Teaching in FY99 and were employed for the first time in the Public School System in FY00. The file provides information on the following variables:

Name of teacher
System Code
School Code -- We do not have names of individual schools
Certificate Type
Certificate Level
Gender
Subject Taught in FY00
Personnel Categories
School System Name
Ethnicity

Note: We have the school codes but not the school names. The combination of System name and School codes uniquely identifies each school.

The data were obtained from the Department of Education Certified Personnel files as well as the Professional Standards Commission's Student Teacher files.

I provided the additional information on Subject taught, personnel categories, etc since these may influence whether or not mentoring is perceived as necessary or the frequency/quality of mentoring. If you do not need the rest of the information, just throw them out. If we can be of futher help, do not hesitate to contact me.

Good luck in your research.

Winifred C. Nweke, Ph.D.
Coordinator for Research
Georgia Professional Standards Commission
1454 Twin Towers, East
Atlanta, GA 30334

Phone: (404) 657 6989
http://www.gapsc.com

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM DR. SHELBY TALLEY

RST Educational Services
Villa Rica, GA 30180
770-214-0620

September 17, 2000

Judi Wilson
305 Cimarron Place
Martinez, GA 30907

Dear Ms. Wilson:

I am delighted you are interested in adding valid information to the current field of knowledge regarding the induction of beginning teachers in Georgia. The Georgia Department of Education and the local school systems have increased the focus on induction, implemented new programs and provided funds for mentoring since I conducted my study. It will be very interesting to see if these efforts have made a difference in the assistance needed and received from the perspective of the beginning teachers.

You have my permission to use the survey instrument I developed. Please feel free to revise as needed. There are questions on the survey related to the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) which no longer exist. The TPAI was the driving force for professional certification and beginning teacher assistance in the state at the time of my study. The entire "on-the-job assessment" for state certification of beginning teachers was eliminated a year or so later. That entire process was very stressful on beginning teachers. Since there is no similar process mandated by the state at this time, I wonder if that might make a difference between our studies.

Please call if I can help in the future.

Sincerely,

Shelby

Shelby Talley, EdD

APPENDIX C

DR. SHELBY TALLEY'S ORIGINAL INSTRUMENT

SURVEY TO DETERMINE THE BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PRACTICES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine (a) the induction practices occurring throughout the state and (b) perceptions of beginning teachers' needs of assistance.

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: Please answer the following general questions.

Respond by checking the blank beside the answer that best applies.

1. Current Level of Position: Primary (K-2) ____ Elementary (3-5) ____
   Middle School (6-8) ____ Secondary (9-12) ____
2. Highest Degree: Bachelor's ____ Master's ____ Other ____ Specify _____
3. Are you a graduate of a teacher education program? yes ___ no ___
4. Are you returning to the teaching profession next school year? yes ___ no ___

SECTION II: GENERAL BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PRACTICES

Directions: Please respond to the following statements regarding induction practices from your experience as a beginning teacher this school year. Respond by checking yes or no.

5. For the beginning teacher, orientation sessions were held at the system level to explain district policies and practices. (If yes, please answer 5a and 5b.) yes ___ no ___
   5a. How many sessions were held? _____
   5b. Approximately how long was each session? _____
6. For the beginning teacher, orientation sessions were held at the school building to explain local school practices and procedures. (If yes, please answer 6a and 6b.) yes ___ no ___
   6a. How many sessions were held? _____
   6b. Approximately how long was each session? _____
7. A Beginning or New Teacher Handbook was provided. yes ___ no ___
8. For the beginning teacher, an experienced teacher was assigned. yes ___ no ___
9. The school system had a formal Mentoring Program. yes ___ no ___
10. The beginning teacher was given a guided tour of the school. yes ___ no ___
11. The beginning teacher was introduced to support personnel in the school (e.g., secretaries, counselors, school nurse, custodians, lunchroom staff, etc). yes ___ no ___
12. For the beginning teacher, special assistance in securing housing was offered. yes ___ no ___
13. For the beginning teacher, information about the community was provided. yes ___ no ___
14. With beginning teachers, the principal scheduled meetings during the first few weeks of school. yes ___ no ___

Page 2
Survey

15. A clearly articulated set of norms or expectations of the teachers employed in the system was evident during recruitment/employment. yes ___ no ___

SECTION III: DIRECT SUPPORT INDUCTION PRACTICES

Directions: The questions in this section refer to induction practices of direct support to the individual teacher. Please answer the questions from your personal experience as a beginning teacher. Check the response that best applies.

16. Were you provided textbooks, curriculum guides, etc., prior to preplanning week? yes ___ no ___

17. As a beginning teacher, was special consideration given to student assignments made to you, e.g., known discipline problems, special needs students, etc.? yes ___ no ___ do not know ___

18. As a beginning teacher were you provided reduced work loads through fewer classes as compared to experienced teachers? yes ___ no ___ do not know ___

19. As a beginning teacher, were you given reduced class sizes as compared to experienced teachers? yes ___ no ___ do not know ___

20. As a beginning teacher, were you provided reduced nonteaching duties and responsibilities as compared to experienced teachers? yes ___ no ___ do not know ___

21. Were you assigned to a teaching area that matched your background and training? yes ___ no ___

22. Were you assigned your own classroom as opposed to "floating" between classrooms? yes ___ no ___

23. Were you provided opportunities to observe experienced teachers? yes ___ no ___

24. Were you provided opportunities to attend inservice/staff development activities designed specifically for beginning teachers? If you answered "yes," how many sessions" ___ yes ___ no ___

25. Were opportunities provided for an experienced teacher to observe you for the purpose of assisting you? yes ___ no ___

26. Has your principal observed in your classroom other than for mandated assessments (Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) or Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI)? yes ___ no ___

27. Were you provided adequate information about the process of beginning teacher evaluation (TPAI)? yes ___ no ___

28. Were you provided assistance in preparation for your beginning teacher evaluation? yes ___ no ___

29. Were you provided adequate feedback about your performance on the beginning teacher assessment (TPAI)? yes ___ no ___ NA ___

30. Were you provided assistance to meet needs identified through the results of the beginning teacher assessment (TPAI)? yes ___ no ___ NA ___

Page 3
Survey

SECTION IV: INDUCTION PRACTICES RELATED TO THE MOST COMMON BEGINNING TEACHER PROBLEMS

Directions:

Step 1. Listed below are the most common problems of beginning teachers. On the left side of each item, please indicate the degree to which you needed assistance. The rating scale ranges from VERY STRONG NEED (VN) to NO NEED (NN).

Step 2. If you received assistance in an area this year, please indicate your perception of the adequacy of the assistance on the right side. The rating scale ranges from VERY ADEQUATE (VA) to INADEQUATE (I). If you were not provided assistance in an area, circle "0" under NOT PROVIDED (NP)

Need for Assistance						Assistance Provided					
	Very Strong Need			No Need			Very Adequate			Inadequate	Not Provided
	VN			NN			VN			IA	NP
31.	4	3	2	1	Classroom discipline		4	3	2	1	0
32.	4	3	2	1	Motivating students		4	3	2	1	0
33.	4	3	2	1	Dealing with individual differences		4	3	2	1	0
34.	4	3	2	1	Assessing students' work		4	3	2	1	0
35.	4	3	2	1	Relations with parents		4	3	2	1	0
36.	4	3	2	1	Organization of classwork (content)		4	3	2	1	0
37.	4	3	2	1	Obtaining sufficient materials and supplies		4	3	2	1	0
38.	4	3	2	1	Dealing with problems of individual students		4	3	2	1	0
39.	4	3	2	1	Preparation time		4	3	2	1	0
40.	4	3	2	1	Relations with other teachers		4	3	2	1	0
41.	4	3	2	1	Planning of lessons and class activities		4	3	2	1	0
42.	4	3	2	1	Effective use of different teaching methods or strategies		4	3	2	1	0
43.	4	3	2	1	Awareness of school policies and rules		4	3	2	1	0
44.	4	3	2	1	Determining learning levels of students		4	3	2	1	0
45.	4	3	2	1	Knowledge of subject matter		4	3	2	1	0
46.	4	3	2	1	Burden of clerical work		4	3	2	1	0
47.	4	3	2	1	Relations with principals/administrators		4	3	2	1	0
48.	4	3	2	1	Obtaining adequate school equipment		4	3	2	1	0
49.	4	3	2	1	Working with slow learners		4	3	2	1	0
50.	4	3	2	1	Working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds		4	3	2	1	0
51.	4	3	2	1	Effective use of textbooks and curriculum guides		4	3	2	1	0
52.	4	3	2	1	Efficient use of time		4	3	2	1	0
53.	4	3	2	1	Obtaining guidance and support		4	3	2	1	0

APPENDIX D

REVISED SURVEY

SURVEY TO DETERMINE BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PRACTICES IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine (a) the induction practices occurring throughout the state and (b) perceptions of beginning teachers' needs of assistance.

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: **Please answer the following questions by checking the blank beside the answer that best applies.**

1. Grade level taught last year: Primary (K-2) _____ Elementary (3-5) _____
   Middle (6-8) _____ Secondary (9-12) _____

2. Were you certified to teach that grade level? yes _____ no _____

3. Are you a graduate of a teacher education program? yes _____ no _____

4. If so, what institution? _____

SECTION II: GENERAL BEGINNING TEACHER INDUCTION PRACTICES

Directions**: Please respond to the following statements regarding induction practices from your experience as a beginning teacher during the previous school year (1999-2000). Respond by checking yes or no.**

5. For the beginning teacher, orientation sessions were held at the system level to explain district policies and practices. (If yes, please answer 5a and 5b.) yes _____ no _____
   5a. How many sessions were held? _____
   5b. Approximately how long was each session? _____

6. For the beginning teacher, orientation sessions were held at the school building to explain local school practices and procedures. (If yes, please answer 6a and 6b.) yes _____ no _____
   6a. How many sessions were held? _____
   6b. Approximately how long was each session? _____

7. A Beginning or New Teacher handbook was provided (a manual designed specifically for first-year teachers). yes _____ no _____

8. For the beginning teacher, an experienced teacher was assigned to serve as a mentor to the new teacher. yes _____ no _____

9. The school system had a formal Mentoring Program. yes _____ no _____

10. The beginning teacher was given a guided tour of the school. yes _____ no _____

11. The beginning teacher was introduced to support personnel in the school (e.g. secretaries, counselors, school nurse, custodians, lunchroom staff, etc.). yes _____ no _____

12. For the beginning teacher, special assistance in securing housing was offered. yes _____ no _____
    not needed _____

13. For the beginning teacher, information about the community was provided. yes _____ no _____

14. With beginning teachers, the principal scheduled meetings during the first few weeks of school. yes _____ no _____

15. A clearly articulated set of norms or expectations of the teachers employed in the system was evident during recruitment/employment. yes _____ no _____

SECTION III: DIRECT SUPPORT INDUCTION PRACTICES

***Directions*: The questions in this section refer to induction practices of direct support to the individual teacher. Please answer the questions from your personal experience as a beginning teacher last year (1999-2000). Check the response that best applies.**

16. Were you provided textbooks, curriculum guides, etc., prior to preplanning week? yes _____ no _____

17. As a beginning teacher, was special consideration given to student assignments made to you, e.g. known discipline problems, special needs students, etc.? yes _____ no _____ do not know_____

18. As a beginning teacher, were you provided with reduced work loads through fewer classes as compared to experienced teachers? yes _____ no _____ do not know_____

19. As a beginning teacher, were you given reduced class sizes as compared to experienced teachers? yes _____ no _____ do not know_____

20. As a beginning teacher, were you provided reduced nonteaching duties and responsibilities as compared to experienced teachers? yes _____ no _____ do not know_____

21. Were you assigned a teaching area that matched your background and training? yes _____ no _____

22. Were you assigned your own classroom as opposed to "floating" between classrooms? yes _____ no _____

23. Were you provided opportunities to observe experienced teachers? yes _____ no _____

24. Were you provided opportunities to attend inservice/staff development activities designed specifically for beginning teachers? If answered "yes," how many sessions? _____ yes _____ no _____

25. Were opportunities provided for an experienced teacher to observe you for the purpose of assisting you? yes _____ no _____

26. Has your principal observed in your classroom other than for mandated assessments (Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument - GTOI or other locally approved instrument)? yes _____ no _____

27. Were you provided adequate information about the process of teacher evaluation? yes _____ no _____

28. Were you provided adequate feedback about your performance during the teacher evaluation(s)? yes _____ no _____

SECTION IV: INDUCTION PRACTICES RELATED TO BEGINNING TEACHERS
Step 1. On the left side of each item, please indicate the degree to which you needed assistance last year (1999-2000). The rating scale ranges from VERY STRONG NEED (VN) to NO NEED (NN).

Step 2. On the right side of each item, indicate your perception of the adequacy of the assistance you received last year (1999-2000) ranging from VERY ADEQUATE (VA) to INADEQUATE (IA). If you were not provided assistance in an area, circle "0" under NOT PROVIDED (NP).

	Need for Assistance					*Assistance Provided*				
	Very Strong Need VN			No Need NN		Very Adequate VA			Inadequate IA	Not Provided NP
29.	4	3	2	1	Classroom discipline	4	3	2	1	0
30.	4	3	2	1	Motivating students	4	3	2	1	0
31.	4	3	2	1	Dealing with individual differences	4	3	2	1	0
32.	4	3	2	1	Assessing students' work	4	3	2	1	0
33.	4	3	2	1	Relating with parents	4	3	2	1	0
34.	4	3	2	1	Organizing classwork (content)	4	3	2	1	0
35.	4	3	2	1	Obtaining materials and supplies	4	3	2	1	0
36.	4	3	2	1	Dealing with individual student's problems	4	3	2	1	0
37.	4	3	2	1	Preparation time	4	3	2	1	0
38.	4	3	2	1	Relating with other teachers	4	3	2	1	0
39.	4	3	2	1	Planning lessons and class activities	4	3	2	1	0
40.	4	3	2	1	Effective use of different teaching methods or strategies	4	3	2	1	0
41.	4	3	2	1	Awareness of school policies and rules	4	3	2	1	0
42.	4	3	2	1	Determining learning levels of students	4	3	2	1	0
43.	4	3	2	1	Knowledge of subject matter	4	3	2	1	0
44.	4	3	2	1	Clerical work	4	3	2	1	0
45.	4	3	2	1	Relating with principals/administrators	4	3	2	1	0
46.	4	3	2	1	Obtaining adequate school equipment	4	3	2	1	0
47.	4	3	2	1	Working with diverse learners	4	3	2	1	0
48.	4	3	2	1	Working with students of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds	4	3	2	1	0
49.	4	3	2	1	Using textbooks/curriculum guides	4	3	2	1	0
50.	4	3	2	1	Efficient use of time	4	3	2	1	0
51.	4	3	2	1	Obtaining guidance and support	4	3	2	1	0
52.	4	3	2	1	Using technology as a management tool	4	3	2	1	0
53.	4	3	2	1	Using technology as a teaching resource	4	3	2	1	0
54.	4	3	2	1	Using technology as an instructional tool	4	3	2	1	0

SECTION IV: MENTORING AND INDUCTION ACTIVITIES

***Directions*: Please answer the following general questions by circling the letter beside the answer that best applies and writing in your comments on the final question.**

55. Approximately, how many times did you meet with your mentor teacher for instructional planning activities during the first month of the teacher induction program?

(a) 0
(b) 1 time
(c) 2 times
(d) 3 times
(e) 4 or more times

56. Approximately, how often did you meet with your mentor teacher for instructional planning activities after the first month of your teaching?

(a) Less than once a month (specify) _____
(b) Once a month
(c) Twice a month
(d) Once a week
(e) Two or more times a week

57. Based upon my experience in the new teacher induction program in my school district, I recommend that the program be:

(a) Continued in its present form without modification
(b) Continued with minor modifications (please specify modifications below in #58)
(c) Continued with major modifications (please specify modifications below in #58)
(d) Be replaced with a different type of program (please specify other program below in #58)

58. What recommendations or suggestions do you have for improving the teacher induction program in your school district?

Please use the enclosed, postage-paid, addressed envelope to return your completed survey immediately to:

Judi H. Wilson
305 Cimarron Place
Martinez, GA 30907

APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING SURVEY

March 22, 2001

Dear Beginning Teacher,

My experience as the coordinator of a teacher induction program in a Georgia school district sparked my interest and concern for the unique needs of beginning teachers across our state. I am genuinely concerned about the incredible obstacles facing new teachers and desire to identify specific ways to better meet your needs as a beginning teacher.

As a result, I am conducting research designed to analyze the perceptions of beginning teachers on the effectiveness of the induction program in school districts across the state of Georgia. Even though I will benefit from the results of the study as part of my doctoral studies at Georgia Southern University, I am hoping that this process will benefit future new teachers in our state as program changes are reviewed and analyzed. I know you are extremely busy, but this survey should take no more than 10 minutes.

Enclosed with this letter is a survey instrument which will be used to analyze responses from a sample of beginning teachers across the state of Georgia. This survey requests that you provide information regarding your personal experience in your school district's teacher induction program during the 1999-2000 school year (your first year of teaching). Completion of the survey will be considered permission to use your results in the study (Informed Consent). Although participation in the survey is voluntary, and there is no penalty should you decide not to participate, your responses will be appreciated and will add validity to the study. Your responses will be treated with absolute confidentiality. The results will be reported only in summary form. (The code number which appears on the survey will be used only for follow-up reminders to those who may not have returned a completed survey).

Please complete this survey as soon as possible. I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience. A copy of the results of the study will be made available to you upon request.

I sincerely appreciate and value your participation in helping to focus attention on the needs of beginning teachers being inducted into our profession. If you have any questions about this research project, please call me, Judi Wilson, collect at 706-228-4108. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant in this study, they should be directed to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-681-5465.

Thank you again for your thoughtful participation in my research efforts and for helping me to identify the needs of beginning teachers in our state! Best of luck as you continue your career in teaching!

Sincerely,

Judi H. Wilson

Judi H. Wilson

APPENDIX F

POSTCARD REMINDER

April 11, 2001

Dear Beginning Teacher,

You were selected as one of a sample of Georgia's beginning teachers to complete a survey related to the experiences and needs of beginning teachers. The survey was mailed to you on March 22nd, but no response has been received to date. It is extremely important that each survey is returned in order to adequately identify the needs of beginning teachers across our state. If you did not receive a survey or have other difficulties or concerns, please call me collect at 706-228-4108.

I greatly appreciate your thoughtful participation and look forward to receiving your response in the mail. If you have already sent in your completed survey, please disregard this reminder and accept my sincere appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,
Judi H. Wilson

APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

April 30, 2001

Dear Beginning Teacher,

I NEED YOUR HELP! You were selected as one of a sample of Georgia's beginning teachers to complete a survey related to the experiences and needs of beginning teachers. The survey was mailed to you on March 22nd, but no response has been received to date. It is extremely important that each survey is returned in order to adequately identify the needs of beginning teachers across our state. **YOUR RESPONSE IS CRITICAL TO THE SUCCESS OF THIS STUDY!!!**

In case there was a problem with your survey, I have enclosed a replacement information package for your convenience. If you have other difficulties or concerns, please call me collect at 706-228-4108.

I sincerely appreciate your thoughtful participation and look forward to receiving your response in the mail. Have a wonderful summer!

Sincerely,

Judi H. Wilson

Judi H. Wilson

APPENDIX H

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTERS

Georgia Southern University
Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Phone: 912-681-5465
Fax: 912-681-0719
Ovrsight@gasou.edu
P.O. Box 8005
Statesboro, GA 30460-8005

To: Judi H. Wilson
Leadership, Technology and Human Development

Cc: Dr. Michael Richardson, Faculty Advisor
Leadership, Technology and Human Development

From: Mr. Neil Garretson, Coordinator
Research Oversight Committees (IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: March 16, 2001

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

---

On behalf of Dr. Howard M. Kaplan, Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I am writing to inform you that we have completed the review of your *Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects* in your proposed research, "Description of New Teacher Induction Programs in the State of Georgia." It is the determination of the Chair, on behalf of the Institutional Review Board, that your proposed research adequately protects the rights of human subjects. Your research is approved in accordance with the *Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects* (45 CFR §46101(b)(1)), which states:

> (1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

However, this approval is conditional upon the following revisions and/or additions being REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE IRB COORDINATOR prior the collection of any data:

1. Please provide EXACT details regarding your proposed random selection methods. Exactly what information will the CPI file contain? How are you obtaining this file? Do you have any written permission that grants you access to this information, or is it in the public domain?

If you have any questions, comments. or concerns about these conditions of approval, please do not hesitate to contact the IRB Coordinator. Please send a copy of all revised and/or additional materials to the IRB Coordinator at the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs (PO Box 8005).

This IRB approval is in effect for one year from the date of this letter. If at the end of that time, there have been no changes to the exempted research protocol, you may request an extension of the approval period for an additional year. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, **whether or not it is believed to be related to the study**, within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator **prior** to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, please notify the IRB Coordinator so that your file may be closed.

Georgia Southern University
Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Phone: 912-681-5465
Fax: 912-681-0719
Ovrsight@gasou.edu
P.O. Box 8005
Statesboro, GA 30460-8005

To: Judi H. Wilson
Leadership, Technology and Human Development

Cc: Dr. Michael Richardson, Faculty Advisor
Leadership, Technology and Human Development

From: Mr. Neil Garretson, Coordinator
Research Oversight Committees (IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: March 21, 2001

Subject: Status of Conditional IRB Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

---

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) Committee has received your revised and/or additional application materials for the approved research titled, "Description of New Teacher Induction Programs in the State of Georgia." You have satisfactorily met the conditions of your Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, as detailed in the March 16, 2001 approval letter. Though I would like to provide a point of clarification, your sampling methodology only allows you to guarantee the confidentiality of the participants, not their anonymity. Please refrain from using the term anonymous/anonymity during the course of this project. Furthermore, bear in mind that confidentiality and anonymity are not synonyms, and are in fact mutually exclusive terms that have differing levels of protection for the research participants.

Please remember that this approval is in effect for one year (3/16/01 – 3/16/02) and if at the end of that time there have been no substantive changes to the approved methodology, you may request a one year extension of the approval period.

Good luck with your research efforts, and if you have any questions, comments, or concerns about the status of your approval, please do not hesitate to contact me.

APPENDIX I

SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPRESENTED BY RESPONDENTS

School Systems Represented by Respondent

System	Number of respondents
Atlanta City	6
Baldwin County	4
Banks County	1
Barrow County	5
Bartow County	4
Berrien County	2
Bibb County	4
Bleckley County	1
Brooks County	1
Buford City	1
Burke County	1
Camden County	2
Carroll County	4
Carrollton City	3
Chatham County	2
Chattahoochee County	1
Chattooga County	1
Cherokee County	2
Clarke County	2
Clayton County	6
Clinch County	1
Cobb County	18
Coffee County	4
Colquitt County	2
Columbia County	4
Commerce City	1
Cook County	4
Coweta County	5
Crisp County	2
Dalton City	16
DeKalb County	9
Dougherty County	3
Douglas County	3
Dublin City	2
Emanuel County	2
Evans County	1
Fayette County	18

School Systems Represented by Respondent

System	Number of respondents
Floyd County	6
Forsyth County	7
Franklin County	1
Fulton County	11
Gainesville City	2
Gilmer County	2
Glynn County	3
Gordon County	2
Grady County	1
Gwinnett County	25
Habersham County	1
Hall County	3
Harris County	2
Hart County	1
Heard County	1
Henry County	2
Houston County	6
Jackson County	1
Jasper County	1
Jefferson City	1
Jefferson County	2
Jones County	2
Lamar County	1
Lanier County	2
Laurens County	1
Lee County	1
Liberty County	6
Lowndes County	3
Madison County	4
Marrietta City	5
Mitchell County	2
Morgan County	1
Murray County	1
Muscogee County	3
Newton County	1
Oconee County	1
Oglethorpe County	1
Paulding County	4

School Systems Represented by Respondent

System	Number of respondents
Peach County	1
Pickens County	1
Pierce County	1
Polk School District	1
Putnam County	1
Richmond County	8
Rockdale County	3
Rome City	2
Social Circle City	1
Stephens County	3
Sumter County	2
Tift County	1
Toombs County	1
Troup County	1
Valdosta City	2
Walker County	2
Walton County	2
Ware County	1
Warren County	1
Wayne County	3
White County	3
Whitfield County	5
Wilkes County	1
Worth County	2